THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVI, No. 5 MAY, 1957

CONTENTS

The Mass and Office of St. Joseph the Worker
Francis L. Filas, S.J. 289

Catholics in Colonial America. Part V . . . . . *John Tracy Ellis* 304

Difficulties of the Translator . . . . . *Malachi J. Donnelly, S.J.* 322

Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary in Twentieth-Century Exhortations to the Catholic Priests
Joseph Clifford Fenton 328

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Joseph Clifford Fenton

The Church *is* our Lord's Mystical Body 338

Holy Saturday Litany 340

Choice of Office during Lent 341

A Problem about Funerals 341

Locks and the Baptistry 341

The *Umbrellino* 342

The *Collectio Rituum* 342

The Solemn Votive Mass 343

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

A Mass Rubric 343
Country or Conscience? 343
The More Frequent Use of the Viaticum 345
A Nourishing Drink on a Fast Day 346

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 347

BOOK REVIEWS

A Call to the Laity, *by Archbishop Cushing* 354
Portrait of Pius XII, *by Nazareno Padellaro* 355
Crown of Glory: The Life of Pope Pius XII, *by Alden Hatch and Seamus Walshe* 355
Papal Social Principles, *by Thomas J. Harte, C.SS.R.* 356
The Choice of God, *by Dom Hubert Van Zeller* 357
The Inner Search, *by Dom Hubert Van Zeller* 357
The Commandment of Love, *by John J. Sullivan, S.J.* 359

You won't want to miss the "new" *Caecilia!* The May issue (Vol. 84, No. 2) will bring you the first chapter of the reprint of Dr. Peter Wagner's "Introduction to the Gregorian Melodies." Limited Subscription. Order now!

CAECILIA

A Review of Catholic Church Music

1 Year Subscription $3.00 **2 Year Subscription $5.00**

P. O. BOX 1012

Omaha 1, Nebraska

THE MASS AND OFFICE OF ST. JOSEPH THE WORKER

The feast of St. Joseph the Worker was first announced by Pope Pius XII in an address given on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Christian Association of Italian Workers, May 1, 1955. "From the beginning," he stated, "We put your organization under the powerful patronage of St. Joseph. Indeed, there could be no better protector to help deepen in your lives the spirit of the Gospel. As We said then (March 11, 1945), that spirit flows to you and to all men from the heart of the God-man, Savior of the world; but certainly, no worker was ever more completely and profoundly penetrated by it than the foster father of Jesus, who lived with Him in closest intimacy and community of family life and work. Thus, if you wish to be close to Christ, We again today repeat, 'Go to Joseph' " (*Gen.* 41:44).

The Holy Father continued:

Yes, beloved workers, the Pope and the Church cannot withdraw from the divine mission of guiding, protecting, and loving especially the suffering, who are all the more dear the more they are in need of defence and help, whether they be workers or other children of the people.

This duty and obligation We, the Vicar of Christ, desire to declare again clearly here on this first day of May, which the world of labor has claimed for itself as its own proper feast day. We intend that all may recognize the dignity of labor, and that this dignity may be the motive in founding the social order and the law founded on the equitable distribution of rights and duties.

Acclaimed in this way by Christian workers and having received, as it were, Christian baptism, the first of May—far from being an incitation to discord, hate, and violence—is and will be a recurring invitation to modern society to accomplish what is still lacking for social peace; a Christian feast, therefore, that is a day of rejoicing for the concrete and progressive triumph of the Christian ideals of the great family of all who labor.

In order that this meaning may remain in your minds and that in some way We may make an immediate return for the many and precious gifts brought to Us from all parts of Italy, We are happy to announce to you Our determination to institute—as We in fact do now

institute—the liturgical feast of St. Joseph the Worker, assigning it to the first day of May. Are you pleased with this Our gift, beloved workers? We are certain that you are, because the humble workman of Nazareth not only personifies before God and the Church the dignity of the man who works with his hands, but he is always the provident guardian of you and your families.[1]

THE INDULT

The archbishops and bishops of the United States at their annual meeting in 1955 petitioned the Holy See for permission to use the mass of this feast of St. Joseph the Worker on Labor Day in September, inasmuch as Labor Day represented the popular celebration of an equivalent of May Day as it occurred in other countries. By an indult of the Congregation of Sacred Rites dated Feb. 25, 1956, this permission was granted for the next ten years. Therefore, according to the conditions of this indult, unless impeded by feasts of high rank the mass of St. Joseph the Worker may be celebrated in the United States and its territories on the first Monday in September. It should be noted, however, that this arrangement does not affect the obligatory use of the proper Mass and Office assigned to May 1 with the rank of double of the first class. The identical permission was granted on Jan. 17, 1956, in reply to a similar request by the Canadian bishops.

Yet even without the indult, practically speaking, the mass of St. Joseph the Worker could be said as a votive mass in every parish every year, except in those years when the third day of September, the feast of St. Pius X, falls on Monday. The reason is, of course, that six of these first seven days of September are either ferials or of simple rank in the Church calendar.

PAST LEGISLATION

The original feast of St. Joseph's Patronage that became the Solemnity of St. Joseph was abolished by a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites dated April 24, 1956, and the feast of St. Joseph the Worker was placed in its stead. However, the title of St. Joseph as Patron of the Universal Church was to be added to his "principal feast," March 19.[2] This action evidently was taken to bring the feasts of St. Joseph into conformity with liturgical

[1] *AAS*, XLVII (1955), 402-07. [2] *Ibid.*, XLVIII (1956), 237.

standards. In the years 1911-1913 St. Pius X had raised the rank of the former St. Joseph's Patronage to a double of the first class with a common octave, to be celebrated first on the third Sunday, and later, on the third Wednesday after Easter. At this juncture certain liturgical writers petitioned that March 19 be reduced to its former rank of double of the second class, since among other reasons, they said, the Saint was now worthily honored by the new feast that was called the Solemnity. The same decree of Oct. 28, 1913, that changed the Solemnity from the third Sunday to the third Wednesday after Easter, reduced March 19 as requested, so that St. Joseph would henceforth have only one primary or principal feast. None the less, Pope Benedict XV re-elevated March 19 to double of the first class on Dec. 12, 1917. In the present arrangement both March 19 and May 1 retain the highest rank possible (double of the first class), but only March 19 is now regarded as Joseph's principal feast.

THE OLD AND THE NEW

Despite full adherence to the spirit of thinking with the Church, many friends of St. Joseph could not conceal their regret at the abolition of the Solemnity of St. Joseph, which they had come to love. Let us tabulate, as it were, the pro's and con's of the change to show that actually nothing was lost—and much was gained.

On the one hand, so it was said, the beautiful text of the mass and office of the Solemnity was lost. That is to be conceded, but only partially. The votive mass of St. Joseph, listed in the Missal, remains as before, and its text remains that of the Solemnity. Moreover, the lesson from Genesis in this mass (i.e. the blessing of Jacob for Joseph; *Gen.* 44:22-25) must in all fairness be listed as among the most difficult to interpret. Popular understanding of the hyperbole, allegory, and Hebrewisms in this passage was almost impossible, certainly for the average Catholic hearing or reading it on his own.

Another difficulty with the Solemnity was its position on the third Wednesday after Easter. It was a grand feast religiously speaking, but was tucked away on a weekday which in the business world was completely insignificant. Only seminaries and religious houses could observe the true sacredness of the occasion. Even the permission to observe the external celebration on the following

Sunday did not receive wide acceptance in the parishes, nor did it serve to make up for the obscurity of the "third Wednesday after Easter."

The feast of St. Joseph the Worker changes this circumstance entirely, particularly in the continental countries where May 1 has become what the September Labor Day is in Canada and the United States. St. Joseph now not only serves to "baptize," as it were, a holiday previously dedicated to the cause of class hatred and anarchical violence, but the secular prominence of May 1 easily attaches itself to the public observance of the new religious holyday.

Even in Canada and in the United States, the choice of May 1 means that periodically—about once every seven years—the parish Sunday mass will be that of Joseph the Worker. The very subject of the feast (Joseph's patronage of labor, and the dignity of labor) is much more intelligible to the popular mind because it is much more concrete. However, it seems inferior theologically to the more exalted and broader, though more abstract, universal patronage of St. Joseph, which was the subject of the former Solemnity and is now included in March 19. Finally, while we are listing advantages, we can realize with joy that we now have a mass fitting Labor Day as never before. The resultant sanctifying of Labor Day is all to the good both for the increase of devotion to St. Joseph and for a proper evaluation of the vocation of labor.

The theological value of the superb orations of the Solemnity remains in the votive mass of St. Joseph. As far as the lessons and homilies of the former office were concerned, practically nothing has been lost. Because of the many feasts of double rank in Paschal time the octave office of the Solemnity could be recited but rarely; the best it obtained was a commemoration. To conclude this analysis of the values of the old and the new feasts, we must admit in any event that the octave of the Solemnity was a necessary casualty in the reform of the breviary whereby so many other important octaves were dropped.

THE OFFICE

The decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, dated April 24, 1956, refers to the new feast as a "Solemnity," yet speaks of March 19 as the "principal feast" of St. Joseph. This indicates that the feast of Joseph the Worker is a secondary feast, though by no

means (as was erroneously stated in certain preliminary editions circulated in the United States) a double of the second class. It is very definitely a double of the first class.

It is referred to as a "Solemnity" because of the magnificence of its external observance, not because the term in this case would have the rubrical meaning indicating the length of the celebration or the possible obligation that some feasts carry to be celebrated by the people *(festa feriata)*. To avoid all possible ambiguity, the title "Solemnity" is omitted from the liturgical edition of the mass and office, but the reference remains in the wording of the Preface *(Et te in solemnitate)*, in the announcement of the Roman Martyrology, and, as already mentioned, in the decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

The word "feast" has come to be restricted more and more to the "natal" feast of the saint in question, *i.e.*, the day of his death. Hence, "Solemnity" for the new feast would tend to show up the difference between May 1 and March 19—historically so intimately linked with St. Joseph as his first feast in the Western Church.

In a certain sense, too, Joseph the Worker is not exclusively a feast of the Saint, as was the Solemnity which it replaced. To quote from *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, it has a double formal object:

(a) The exalted dignity of St. Joseph in his capacity as foster father of our Lord Jesus Christ, spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a humble workman, and the patron of workmen; and

(b) the dignity of human work imposed on man by the hand of God, and sanctified by the divine Redeemer under the lead of St. Joseph.[3]

VESPERS

When we note that the psalms for First Vespers are taken from the common of a confessor not a bishop, we see still one lingering echo of the age-old obscurity of St. Joseph, recalling that the first local masses and offices of St. Joseph (which later evolved into the text for March 19) were mere adaptations of the same common for a confessor saint who apparently had nothing more special by way of distinction. Fortunately, this primitive situation regarding St. Joseph has been radically changed.

[3] *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, LXX (1956), 356.

The proper antiphons for Vespers and Lauds express the fundamental idea of work, looking at it as it appears in God the creator of the world; in Christ, the Son of God; in St. Joseph, the faithful workman; in St. Joseph, head of the Holy Family; and in St. Joseph, patron of human accomplishments and crafts.

The first antiphon is a paraphrase of Genesis:

Deus, mundi opifex, posuit hominem ut operaretur et custodiret terram.

"God, the creator of the world, placed man that he should work and watch over the land."

The second antiphon refers exclusively to Our Lord:

Christus, Dei Filius, manibus suis operari dignatus est.

"Christ, the Son of God, deigned to work with His hands."

The third begins the references to St. Joseph:

Artem fabri fideliter exercens sanctus Joseph, laboris mirabile refulget exemplar.

"Faithfully exercising the craft of a carpenter, St. Joseph shines forth as the admirable exemplar of work."

The fourth antiphon is a paraphrase of the Gospel reference to the "Prudent and loyal servant, whom"—it adds—"God has placed over His household."

Fidelis servus et prudens, quem constituit Dominus super familiam suam.

The fifth antiphon reads, "Joseph, holy workman, protect our works." It is to be noted that the reference here is evidently to *all* human endeavors—*opera*—in contradistinction to labor—*opus*—as such.

Joseph, opifex sancte, opera nostra tuere.

The chapter at Vespers (which, like the antiphons, recurs at Lauds) excellently emphasizes the spirit of Christian peace and charity which should pervade the relationships between labor and management, and among workmen themselves: "Brethren, have charity, which is the bond of perfection, and may the peace of Christ reign in your hearts. Show yourselves thankful."[4]

The Vespers hymn, *Te, Joseph, celebrent,* is the same as the hymn at Vespers for March 19 and as it was in the former feast of

[4] *Col.* 3: 14 f.

the Solemnity. It is a magnificent canticle to the glory of the Saint, summarizing first, the main events in Joseph's life on earth, and second, his glory in heaven. However, the versicle and response for Vespers are completely new: *Solemnitas est hodie sancti Joseph, qui manibus suis Filio Dei ministravit.* "Today is the solemnity of St. Joseph, who by his hands ministered to the Son of God."

The antiphon at the *Magnificat* pronounces a theme of the feast that recurs in the *Invitatorium: Christus Dominus fabri filius putari dignatus est.* "Christ the Lord deigned to be thought the son of the carpenter." And: *Regem regum Dominum, qui putari dignatus est fabri filius, Venite adoremus.* "Come, let us adore the Lord, King of kings, who deigned to be thought the son of the carpenter." Something of this idea also appears in the versicle and response at Sext: *Verbum Dei per quod facta sunt omnia, dignatus est operari manibus suis.* "The Word of God, through whom all things were made, deigned to work with His hands." It recurs again in the antiphon at the *Magnificat* for Second Vespers (which in all other respects is the same as First Vespers): "And Jesus Himself, when He began His work, was about thirty years of age, being supposed to be the son of Joseph." This is a direct quotation from *Luke* 3:23, and was formerly the antiphon for None in the Solemnity.

The oration of the office, together with its complementary secret and postcommunion in the Mass, is written in the terse style of the Roman sacramentaries, and again keynotes the theme of the dignity of work and the intercession and example of St. Joseph. The secret adds to this the petition that the offerings at the Mass, made from the fruits of our labors, would be a pledge of unity and peace. We will consider all three of these prayers at once, since logically they go together:

Rerum conditor Deus, qui legem laboris humano generi statuisti: concede propitius; ut, sancti Joseph exemplo et patrocinio, opera perficiamus quae praecipis, et praemia consequamur quae promittis. "O God, the creator of all things, who has set forth the law of labor for the human race, graciously grant that by the example and patronage of Saint Joseph, we may carry out the works which You have ordered, and may obtain the rewards which You promise."

In the secret prayer, the dignity of work is tied in very explicitly with the charity and peace which should exist—probably, as re-

ferred to, first in the general sense among all Christians. We may logically extend this prayer for unity and peace to the field of labor and management as well.

Quas tibi, Domine, de operibus manuum nostrarum offerimus hostias, sancti Joseph interposito suffragio, pignus facias nobis unitatis et pacis. "O Lord, through the interceding prayer of Saint Joseph may You make the offerings to you from the works of our hands become a pledge of unity and peace."

Something of this idea of labor appears even in the postcommunion: "Through the intercession of blessed Joseph, O Lord, may these sacred things we have received both fill out [the defects of] our actions, and confirm our rewards." *Haec sancta quae sumpsimus, Domine: per intercessionem beati Joseph; et operationem nostram compleant, et praemia confirment.*

MATINS

We return now to the office, continuing with the new hymn at Matins, which actually does not replace any hymn from the former Solemnity since the Solemnity had merely repeated the *Te, Joseph, celebrent* once again. Strikingly new are two references to "father Joseph." These do not seem to indicate in any direct way Joseph's relationship to our Lord, but rather his fatherly protection and fatherly attitude toward us, his clients and friends. However, even in this one might justly discern some signs of a "break-through" on the part of the Church—to speak colloquially—in describing and honoring explicitly in the liturgy the miraculous spiritual fatherhood of Jesus which had been bestowed on Joseph. We grant without the slightest hesitation that the centuries of obscurity for St. Joseph were almost necessitated by the fear that his fatherly position at Nazareth might be misunderstood as natural fatherhood. Now that the rightful doctrine is so firmly and clearly proclaimed, and now that Josephite theology can offer terms which describe so unique a fatherhood in more precise terms—especially "virgin father"—it may well be that the bonds between Joseph and Jesus will be described in the liturgy more explicitly, more frequently, and as something more than mere foster father, i.e. *nutricius* and *protector.*

This Matins hymn calls attention to the canonical hour when Matins are sung: night. "With strong voices and full hearts we will

sing of you by night, O father Joseph, workman to be venerated, blessedly hidden in the shadows of Nazareth."

Te, pater Joseph, opifex colende,
Nazarae felix latitans in umbra,
Vocibus magnis animisque plenis
Nocte canemus.

In stanza two, "With unperturbed soul and in silence do you bear your royal ancestry and your modest livelihood, while you support your sacred charges by the extensive work of your hands." One is reminded here of the prayer for purity, suggested by the Church in the prayers after mass, which refers to Jesus and Mary as Joseph's *utrumque carissimum pignus.*

Regiam stirpem tenuemque victum
Mente fers aequa tacitusque portas,
Sacra dum multo manuum labore
Pignora nutris.

In the third stanza, "O craftsman, O sacred mirror of craftsmen, how strong a living proof do you give to commonfolk, that heavy labor, that the factory, too, might be sanctified!" It is true that this tribute could also refer to Jesus, because of His example during the Hidden Life, but from the context of the hymn it evidently deals with Joseph.

O faber, sanctum speculum fabrorum,
Quanta das plebi documenta vitae,
Ut labor sudans, ut et officina
Sanctificetur.

The fourth stanza changes from descriptive to invocative tone: "Help starving unfortunates; restrain those who live outside all law; bring strife to an end. May the mystical Christ grow under the protection of your fatherly overshadowing." This is a clear mention of St. Joseph's position as Patron of the Universal Church where he lives out, as Leo XIII had said, the position he first had in the Holy Family at Nazareth. The Church then, as the Mystical Body of Christ, needs and begs for Joseph's protection. It is to be noted that the "fatherly shadow" mentioned here describes Joseph's patronage of the Church, and only indirectly implies Joseph's fatherly relationship toward Jesus.

Qui carent escis, miseros fovete;
Tempera effrenos perimasque lites;
Mysticus Christus patriae sub umbrae
Tegmine crescat.

The hymn ends with a doxology that plays on the word "father" as applied to God as creator, and to Joseph. "You, O God, three and similarly one, You who are the father of all mankind and the maker of all things, grant that we may imitate our father Joseph in all our actions; grant that we may imitate him by our death." One could say that the idea here is to imitate Joseph "in life and in death." Very fittingly, the hymn does not forget Joseph's position as patron of a happy death because he died in the company of Jesus and Mary.

Tu Deus trinus pariterque et unus,
Qui pater cunctis opifexque rerum,
Fac patrem Joseph imitemur actu,
Morte imitemur. Amen.

The First Nocturn is almost completely devoted to the theme of the dignity of labor, imposed by God's command. Readings from the first three chapters of Genesis depict God as working at creation; Adam as working the Garden of Paradise before the Fall; and Adam as receiving the punishment of work because of his sin. The antiphon (taken from *Psalm* 103:23) says, "Man goes abroad to toil and to drudge till the evening." The versicle and response invoke St. Joseph as the "glory and exemplar of workmen, he whom the Son of God willed to obey." It is evident that except for this reference, the First Nocturn is dedicated to the dignity of work in itself, the partial theme of the feast.

The general idea of the Second Nocturn again is that labor is made noble and can be lifted to a higher level. The antiphon quotes *Luke* 3:23, concerning the popular belief that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph at the time when He was about to begin His Public Life. Summarizing the concepts expressed by Pius XII in his allocution of May 1, 1955, the fourth, fifth, and sixth lessons are ideally introduced by a versicle and response later recurring at Terce: "O the great dignity of labor, which Christ sanctified!" Since we have already quoted the pertinent portions of the Pope's

discourse at the beginning of this study, they do not need further comment here.

The Third Nocturn explicitly introduces Joseph in its antiphon, using the two texts from *Matthew* 13:55 and *Luke* 4:22: "Is not this the son of the carpenter? Is not this the son of Joseph?" The gospel is on the same subject, i.e., the scandal of the people at Jesus' lowly origin. It concludes with the pithy comment that Jesus did not work many signs because of local incredulity.[5] One wonders whether this closing sentence is not to have the effect of emphasizing the faith and trust in God's providence which should be part of the true Christian attitude toward labor.

The homilies of St. Albertus Magnus were chosen for these concluding lessons of Matins. Their general theme is to extol St. Joseph together with the Son whom God had miraculously given him and who condescended to be a workman. From the viewpoint of the theology of St. Joseph in its present development, one might have desired homilies which would have put St. Joseph somewhat more in the forefront. However, the fact is that no other gospel text refers so explicitly to St. Joseph's trade; and even in the pericope selected for the mass and office, the reference is indirect. St. Albertus Magnus pointedly brings out the idea that Joseph's trade and supposed natural fatherhood of Jesus were used by the scribes and pharisees as means of showing contempt for our Lord.

LAUDS

We come now to the hymn at Lauds, which replaces the former *Caelitum, Joseph, decus* of the Solemnity. The earlier hymn was valuable for its theological tributes to Joseph as *ministrum salutis* —an intimate cooperator, in other words, of the Incarnation; and *Sator rerum voluit te patrem Verbi dici*—God the Father willed that Joseph should be called the father of Jesus. However, the new *Aurora, solis nuntia* is hardly inferior in this respect. "The dawn that announces the sun and introduces the month of flowers salutes the house of Nazareth, which rings with the sound of the carpenter's hammer." Here, of course, is a reference to dawn, the hour of Lauds, and to the May 1, date of the feast. Would it be amiss to comment on the northern-hemisphere calendar which is

[5] *Matt.*, 13: 54-58.

followed here, and which seems to forget the opposite climactic conditions for those south of the equator?

Aurora, solis nuntia
Florumque mensi praevia,
Fabri sonoram malleo
Domum salutat Nazarae.

The second stanza speaks of St. Joseph's position as head of the Holy Family and of his fatherly authority in teaching the Child Jesus: "Hail, head of the family, under whose [tutelage] the supreme Craftsman, dripping with perspiration, exercises the craft of His father" (i.e., Joseph).

Salve, caput domesticum,
Sub quo supremus Artifex
Sudore salso roridus,
Exercet artem patriam.

The third stanza is the clearest reference to Joseph's unparalleled dignity and holiness as second only to Mary. One is reminded of Leo XIII's forthright statement in his encyclical, *Quamquam Pluries,* "There can be no doubt that more than any other person he approached that super-eminent dignity by which the Mother of God is raised far above all other created natures." But here the hymn reads, addressing St. Joseph: "High in heaven, closest to your exalted spouse, help now your clients whom want presses sorely." Then it continues, "May violence, discord, and dishonesty be absent from business life; may the means of livelihood be distributed in due proportion."

Altis locatus sedibus
Celsaeque Sponsae proximus,
Adesto nunc clientibus,
Quos vexat indigentia.

Absintque vis et jurgia,
Fraus omnis a mercedibus,
Victus cibique copiam
Mensuret una parcitas.

Finally, for the doxology, "O oneness of the Trinity, we ask through the intercession of Joseph, that You direct all our ways in peace."

O Trinitatis Unitas,
Joseph precante, quaesumus,
In pace nostros omnium
Gressus viamque dirige. Amen.

The versicle and response in Lauds (which are also used in None and Second Vespers) may well become a new popular invocation of the Saint: "Pray for us, Saint Joseph, faithful protector of our labors!"

OTHER HOURS

The Little Chapters for Terce, Sext, and None need not concern us at great length, except for noting that they are brief direct quotations from *Col.* 3:14 f., 17, and 23 f. In this way the short lesson in the mass is made part of the office, with nothing omitted. But the sublimity of the doctrine of this well-known passage merits its repetition here: "Brethren, have charity, which is the bond of perfection, and may the peace of Christ reign in your hearts; unto that peace, indeed, you were called in one body. Show yourselves thankful. Whatever you do in word or in work, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God the Father through Him. Whatever you do, work at it from the heart as for the Lord and not for men, knowing that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward. Serve the Lord Christ." Clearly here, there appears the thought of the dignity of work. No more fitting passage in Scripture could have been selected for this purpose.

THE MASS

Little remains to be said by way of commentary on the mass since so many of the texts already were discussed in connection with the office. The Introit from the Book of Wisdom (10:17) is aptly chosen to show how God, the Eternal Wisdom, has given the just the merits of their labors, leading them wonderfully, protecting their way by day and lighting it by night. An implicit reference to St. Joseph, the just man *par excellence,* is thus included here. Then follows the prudent caution from *Psalm* 126:1 concerning the need for God's blessing on whatever we do. "Unless the Lord builds the house, they labor in vain who build it."

The Alleluja versicles after the lesson are taken over bodily from the former feast of St. Joseph's Solemnity. "From whatever tribulation they have called to me, I shall hear them, and I shall

be their protector forever." In the present case the statement is applied to St. Joseph, but it is originally a composition of ecclesiastical origin, referring to God, and is part of the Introit for the 19th Sunday after Pentecost. The *fac nos innocuam,* freely translated as "Help us, St. Joseph, in our earthly strife, ever to lead a blameless life," continues here and also as an indulgenced prayer asking St. Joseph's intercession.[6]

The text of the mass also provides a Gradual, Alleluja, and Tract so that it can be used as a votive mass outside Paschal time. The quotations from *Psalms* 127 and 111 (and, in fact, from all other Psalms elsewhere in this mass and office) are from the new Latin translation published in 1945.

Thus, the new Psalms are again used in the Offertory antiphon, taken directly from 89 : 17. These are the words which are recited daily at Prime according to the Vulgate version, when God's blessing is asked on the works of the coming day : *Et sit splendor Domini Dei nostri super nos, et opera manuum nostrarum dirige super nos, et opus manuum nostrarum dirige.* But in the new translation they would mean, "May the goodness of God our Lord be upon us, and prosper the work of our hands for us, prosper the work of our hands." The evident prayer for God's blessing on one's labors makes this again an ideal prayer-theme.

We have already mentioned the distinction between the liturgical titles of "feast" and "solemnity." It was evidently to keep the force of this distinction, namely, that this is not the principal feast of St. Joseph, that a new embolism or insertion was prepared for the Preface of St. Joseph. There is retained for March 19 the wording of praising God "on the feast of St. Joseph," and for votive masses, the wording, "in venerating St. Joseph"; but for May 1 the preface will read, *Et te in solemnitate.* The new feast, then, is considered serious enough to merit special mention in a special preface—certainly a new liturgical honor for St. Joseph.

The Communion of the mass is a quotation from the Gospel, "Whence this knowledge and power? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary? Alleluja."

[6] *Enchiridion Indulgentiarum,* n. 458.

Throughout this commentary on a mass and office in Paschal time, we have omitted the recurring "alleluja's" since they would be taken for granted. However, perhaps we should end on the triumphant and grateful note of "alleluja," wondering what thoughts would be in the minds of the pioneers of the devotion to St. Joseph if they could be back on earth with us to hear the Roman Martyrology for May 1: "The solemnity of St. Joseph the worker, spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Confessor, Patron of workmen." This is a far cry from the obscurity of past centuries. In the providence of God, for the greater glory of God, to know Jesus and Mary better and to imitate St. Joseph more closely, may this new feast of Joseph the Worker be a promise of even greater liturgical honors to come. The goal is quite explicit; it is a constant refrain in Josephological writings of the last century—that the name of St. Joseph would be linked with that of his virginal wife, the Mother of God, in certain prayers of the mass.

FRANCIS L. FILAS, S.J.

Loyola University
Chicago, Ill.

CATHOLICS IN COLONIAL AMERICA

PART V

The Protestant clergy were, indeed, highly articulate on the subject of the Revolution. It has rightly been said, "Ministers of religion in large numbers, especially the dissenters, seem to have turned from the gospel to revolution. Such is the testimony of friend and foe."[78] The Quebec Act, for example, stirred them to heated attacks on the perils of Romanism, and since the dissenting clergy saw in the Revolution a chance to end the privileged status which the Church of England enjoyed in a number of the colonies, they were particularly outspoken. When one recalls that of the 3,105 religious congregations in the thirteen original colonies at the coming of the war only 480 were Anglican it will be seen how powerful, by comparison, was the voice of the dissenters.[79] For obvious reasons the Anglican ministers were overwhelmingly opposed to the break, and as the trend of events went against them many either departed from the country or lapsed into a discreet silence.

Meanwhile practically nothing was heard on the burning political issues of the day from the Catholic pulpits in Philadelphia, nor is there any extant evidence to show that the Maryland priests made them the subject of the sermons they preached to their congregations in the manor house chapels of the Maryland Catholic gentry. As we have seen, Father Carroll had stated his disapproval of ministers of religion leaving the duties of their profession "to take a busy part in political matters," and there is every reason to believe that this attitude of the most prominent American priest of the time was shared by his colleagues. Even had they been disposed

[78] Beard, *op. cit.*, I, 259.

[79] J. Franklin Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement* (Princeton, 1926), p. 85. The distribution was as follows: Congregational 658, Presbyterian 543, Baptist 498, Quaker 295, German and Dutch Reformed 261, Lutheran 151, and Catholic 50. One of the Anglican loyalist ministers who left Maryland for England was Jonathan Boucher. He later stated that his political views were the cause of his being reported as an enemy of the country to a committee in Annapolis by a Catholic living within his parish, St. Anne's in Prince George's County. (*Op cit.*, p. 242.)

to speak out, the very tenuous position of the Catholics would incline them to more reticence on subjects of this kind than their Protestant counterparts. In any case, the policy that the Catholic clergy then assumed of going quietly about their business and leaving the world of politics to the laymen, became a fixed one that has ever since marked the conduct of the great majority of priests in the United States. Privately, of course, these men had their opinions on the war, but insofar as we know they left the laity entirely free to make up their own minds on political affairs.

The clergy's discretion and the unstinted war service of the great majority of the Catholic laity were not sufficient, however, to dispel from the minds of most Americans their deep-rooted dislike and suspicion of the Church. That the Catholics had given wholehearted support to the Revolution, there was no doubt. One Anglican loyalist minister regretted that they had lacked courage to oppose the war, but he conceded that, "with all the bad principles respecting Civil Government so frequently imputed to them, they are clear of any suspicion of having begun that in America; nor have they been found to be either refractory or turbulent subjects under a Government of which it is hardly possible that they can cordially approve."[80] In this respect the Catholics of the United States suffered the same fate and endured it with the same forbearance as their coreligionists in every part of the world where British hatred of the Church of Rome had impressed itself. And nowhere was this more apparent than in the two countries from which so many of the American Catholics had taken their origin. All through the eighteenth century the Catholics of Ireland had lived as outlaws because of their religious faith. But in the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745, and through the long war with France that ended in 1763, they had remained so loyal to the crown that the leading Protestant historian of Ireland could say that, "officials in high position had repeatedly acknowledged that the severest scrutiny had discovered no trace of treasonable conduct among them, and had consented that, in times of great danger to the Empire, Ireland should be left almost destitute of troops."[81] The same thing was true of the

[80] Boucher, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

[81] William E. H. Lecky, *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1893), II, 202. Near the end of his letter of January 3, 1792, to Sir Hercules Langrishe on the Catholics of Ireland, Edmund Burke said of

Catholics of England. In his famous speech at Bristol in September, 1780, wherein Edmund Burke defended his advocacy of the Catholic relief bill, he reviewed the infamies that had been visited upon them, and with special reference to the Gordon Riots of that summer, he said:

> But, though provoked by everything that can stir the blood of men, their houses and chapels in flames, and with the most atrocious profanations of everything which they hold sacred before their eyes, not a hand was moved to retaliate, or even to defend. . . . I am well informed, and the thing speaks it, that their clergy exerted their whole influence to keep their people in such a state of forbearance and quiet, as, when I look back, fills me with astonishment, — but not with astonishment only. Their merits on that occasion ought not to be forgotten; nor will they, when Englishmen come to recollect themselves.[82]

Yet so thoroughly had they been indoctrinated with anti-Catholic bias that it took another half century for the English to recollect themselves fully on the injustice done to the Catholics. The situation was pretty much the same on this side of the Atlantic in these years. After the fighting had ceased and the preliminary peace with Great Britain had been signed in November, 1782, men began to adjust themselves once more to a normal life. And major adjustments there had to be in both Church and State. Among the most progressive of the former Anglican divines who had remained loyal to America was William White, soon to be elected as the first Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Pennsylvania. White was extremely anxious to unify as many of the former Anglican congregations as possible into one church. In December, 1785, he wrote to Charles Miller, a member of the old King's Chapel congregation in Boston, which showed signs of wandering off into Unitarianism. He expressed amazement that the value of a unified organization was not appreciated, especially, he said, "in relation to the guarding

---

the penal system in that country, "You abhorred it, as I did, for its vicious perfection. For I must do it justice: it was a complete system, full of coherence and consistency, well digested and well composed in all its parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement, in them, of human nature itself as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." *The Works of the Right Honorable Edmund Burke* 7th ed. (Boston, 1881), IV, 305.

[82] *Ibid.*, II, 413-414.

against the progress of a church as yet scarcely known in your country." White felt that the claims of Rome on a worldwide scale were too well known to do harm, but when that Church talked of unity in a neighborhood or district its appeal sounded much more plausible and, he concluded, "antiquity will be so much on her side, that I am afraid it will make many take the less exception to her erroneous doctrines."[83]

Suspicion of a different kind showed itself in state affairs. In the Massachusetts convention of February, 1788, which ratified the Constitution, debate on the article dispensing with a religious test for office holding brought grave uneasiness to some. Major Thomas Lusk, a delegate from West Stockbridge, voted against the Constitution for that reason since, as he said, "he shuddered at the idea that Roman Catholics, Papists, and Pagans might be introduced into office, and that Popery and the Inquisition may be established in America."[84] In North Carolina's convention in July of the same year Henry Abbot's scruple related to the treaty making powers of the federal government which made him fear that, "they might make a treaty engaging with foreign powers to adopt the Roman Catholic religion in the United States, which would prevent the people from worshipping God according to their own conscience."[85]

In the ratifying conventions of most of the states, as in Massachusetts and North Carolina, there were, of course, no Catholic voices to give assurance on the subject of the Church's position, although they would probably not have been heeded if they had been there. But Pennsylvania and Maryland each had a respected Catholic statesman who had played an honorable role in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia where they had both worked for a strong national government. These two men then carried their views into the respective ratifying conventions when the issue came before their states. In Pennsylvania Thomas FitzSimons, who had been a member of Congress under the Articles of Confederation and also of the state legislature, had first-hand experience with

[83] White to Miller, December 1, 1785, in Bird Wilson, *Memoir of the Life of the Right Reverend William White* (Philadelphia, 1839), pp. 326-327.

[84] Jonathan Elliot (Ed.), *The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. . . .* (Washington, 1836), II, 148.

[85] *Ibid.*, IV, 191-192.

weak governments. He was intent, therefore, that the new national government should not be denied real powers. When a threat of delay in calling an election for a ratifying convention developed in his own state he vigorously contended that neither Congress nor the legislature had any right to make the decision. That right rested with the people. Speaking of the Constitution, FitzSimons said:

> The sentiments of the people, so far as they have been collected, have been unanimously favorable to its adoption, and its early adoption, if their representatives think it a good one; if we set the example now, there is a great prospect of its being generally come into; but if we delay, ill consequences may arise.[86]

In the end Pennsylvania was the second state to ratify the Constitution on December 12, 1787, and FitzSimons' speech of the previous September 29 had done its share to hasten the result.

Maryland was slower to act, and there Daniel Carroll, brother of the future archbishop, brought to bear his knowledge and experience as a delegate to the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention in behalf of early ratification. When Samuel Chase counseled delay Carroll addressed the people of Baltimore in mid-October through one of the principal newspapers. He recalled Chase's promise to work for a ratifying convention, and he also reminded the people of the resolution of the Constitutional Convention to the effect that a ratifying body should be assembled in the states without delay. Carroll urged the Baltimoreans, therefore, to petition the legislature for a convention. Since he thought that the legislature's recommendation of a convention would imply a complete approval of the Constitution, he counseled, "there is the greatest propriety and necessity of your telling the legislature that it meets your approbation."[87] As for the merits of the Constitution itself, Carroll found that a speech of James Wilson of Pennsylvania expressed his own views so well that he concluded his argument with a lengthy quotation from what Wilson had told the people of Philadelphia. The Maryland ratifying convention finally assembled in late April, 1788, and after a week of heated debate the Federalists won the day on April 28 by a vote of sixty-three to eleven.

[86] *Proceedings and Debates of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1787), I, 132.

[87] *Maryland Journal*, October 16, 1787.

Regardless of what their fellow citizens might think of the Church and its teachings, once the peace treaty had been signed with Great Britain it was obviously impossible for the Catholics to continue any longer the awkward arrangement of being governed by Bishop James Talbot in London.[88] In fact, that government had been rendered still more ineffective with the coming of the war, and as early as the summer of 1774 John Carroll's patriotism was evidenced when he became the first American priest to refuse recognition to the authority of Father John Lewis, vicar general of the Vicar Apostolic of the London District. And in 1783 Bishop Talbot took a realistic stand by declining to grant faculties to two American priests who were returning home from Europe. All parties were now agreed that some kind of radical change would have to be effected for the governance of the Catholic Church in the new nation.

There were a number of factors which accounted for the hesitation and delay that ensued before a satisfactory solution to the problem was found. Up to 1783 the Catholics had won a clear equality of rights as citizens in only five states: Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Rhode Island, and Virginia. They were, of course, painfully conscious of the bias with which their Church was viewed, and in the light of their prolonged penal status it is not surprising to find Father Carroll remarking to the Holy See as late as 1785, "But how long we are to enjoy the benefits of this toleration or equal rights, I would not dare to assert."[89] Moreover, Carroll and his fellow priests were fully aware of the particular prejudice of most American Protestants against bishops, nor were they encouraged to think along those lines as they watched the struggle of the emerging Episcopalians to establish an episcopal

[88] Speaking of Bishop Challoner's last years which overlapped the American Revolution, his biographer stated, "It is indeed a strange and curious fact to remember, but it is none the less true, that, during the rest of Bishop Challoner's life, his jurisdiction over his American priests and people remained the only remnant of authority in the hands of an Englishman that was still recognised in America. King and Parliament and Ministry had lost their power, but this feeble old man, living his retired life in an obscure London street, still continued to issue his faculties and dispensations for the benefit of his Catholic children in Maryland and Pennsylvania." Burton, *op. cit.*, II, 148.

[89] Carroll to Antonelli, February 27, 1785, Guilday, *op. cit.*, I, 215, where the entire document is given, pp. 214-219.

form of government for their church. If the Episcopalians were finding it difficult to move forward, how could the Catholics hope to do so? A second reason for delay related to an internal problem involving the character of the Catholic clergy. When the war closed they consisted of about twenty-five or thirty priests, all former members of the suppressed Society of Jesus and all retaining, naturally enough, a strong attachment to their old allegiance. In the complicated case of the Jesuit suppression and its aftermath a number of the officials of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide at Rome had shown themselves hostile to the interests of the suppressed society, and for that reason these American priests were highly suspicious of Propaganda's moves lest they should jeopardize the ex-Jesuits' position and properties in the United States.

In addition to these factors the independence of the United States created an entirely new situation for the Holy See. Never before had it been confronted with the responsibility of erecting an ecclesiastical government in a democratic republic, overwhelmingly Protestant in sentiment, at a distance of over 3,000 miles from Rome. What the new republic would do about religion on a national scale, was still unknown. Under circumstances such as these it was understandable that Leonardo Cardinal Antonelli, Prefect of Propaganda, should turn to France, America's ally in the recent war, and itself a Catholic power, for advice as to how to proceed. It was Antonelli, therefore, who took the initiative in January, 1783, with Archbishop Giuseppe Doria-Pamphili, Apostolic Nuncio to France, by asking him to sound out the officials of the French government concerning an organization for the American Church. This approach ultimately resulted in an exchange of views between Doria-Pamphili and Benjamin Franklin, American Minister to France, in the summer of that year. Doria-Pamphili proposed that the American Catholics be placed for the time being under the rule of a French ecclesiastic, and he asked that Franklin submit his proposal to the American Congress for its approval. It was a touchy question for Congress, involving as it did the relations between Church and State. After debating it at some length Congress finally informed Franklin on May 11, 1784, that while it would always be pleased to testify its respect for the pope and the state over which he ruled, the subject of the nuncio's application to the American minister, as it was stated, "being purely

spiritual, it is without the jurisdiction and powers of Congress, who have no authority to permit or refuse it, these powers being reserved to the several states individually."[90] Rome would have to proceed on its own, therefore, without an official opinion from the government of the United States.

In all the negotiations over the question of what form the future organization of the Church in this country should take the American Catholic clergy had not even been consulted. Since these conversations lasted from January, 1783, to June, 1784, and involved officials in Rome, Paris, and Philadelphia, they could scarcely be kept entirely secret. The clergy got wind of them and they felt the slight very keenly. There was no question of their loyalty to the Holy See, but there definitely was a question of their willingness to submit to arrangements made by Propaganda without their advice and consultation. Carroll made that quite clear in the spring of 1784 when he told an old English priest friend:

> But this you may be assured of; that no authority derived from the Propa[gan]da will ever be admitted here; that the Catholic Clergy and laity know that the only connection they ought to have with Rome is to acknowledge the Pope as Spir[itual] head of the Church; that no Congregations existing in his States shall be allowed to exercise any share of his Spir[itua]l authority here, that no Bishop Vicar Apostolical shall be admitted, and, if we are to have a Bishop, he shall not be *in partibus* (a refined political Roman contrivance), but an ordinary national Bishop, in whose appointment Rome shall have no share: so that we are very easy about their machinations.[91]

---

[90] Ford, *op. cit.*, XXVII, 368. The reply of Congress to Franklin, in the judgment of one writer of American diplomatic history, helped to set a precedent for separation of Church and state. He said, "The importance and value of this action, to all the subsequent history of the nation, are scarcely to be over-estimated. It was the sure precursor of the constitutional prohibition of any state church or of any governmental meddling with religious affairs. . . ." Willis Fletcher Johnson, *America's Foreign Relations* (New York, 1916), I, 136.

[91] Carroll to Charles Plowden, April 10, 1784, Jules A. Baisnée, *France and the Establishment of the American Catholic Hierarchy. The Myth of French Interference, 1783-1784* (Baltimore, 1934), p. 65. This work, written to refute the thesis of Shea, Guilday, and others that France tried by intrigue to gain control of the Church in this country, reprints the principal documents in the case.

This was plain speaking, indeed, but it represented the thinking of the clergy at the time, and it augured ill for the plan of Cardinal Antonelli and Archbishop Doria-Pamphili to place the American Church under a French superior. The attitude of Carroll and his confrères not only reflected their dislike of Propaganda, but it showed as well their thorough American spirit in resenting the suggestion that they should be ruled by a foreign ecclesiastic.

In the end wiser counsels prevailed and on June 9, 1784, the Holy See appointed John Carroll as superior of the American missions with the understanding that the arrangement was meant to be only temporary. The new superior did not at all welcome the weighty responsibility, but as a loyal son of the Church he accepted it in the awareness that an organization of some kind had become a pressing necessity and, too, in the hope that he might offer at least a partial solution to certain grave difficulties which then faced the American Catholics. One of these related to a clever attack on Catholic doctrine which appeared in the spring of 1784 from the pen of Charles Wharton, a former Jesuit, and the first American priest to apostatize from the Church. Carroll carefully prepared a lengthy answer in which he explained the true Catholic teaching on the points which Wharton had misrepresented. He confessed that he had a profound distaste for religious controversy, but he stated that the compelling motive which prompted him to write was his belief that a defense of their faith was owed to the Catholics who might be misled by Wharton. Yet even that high motive would not have been sufficient if, as he said, he could fear that his reply would disturb the harmony existing at the moment between the various Christian churches. That Carroll wholeheartedly accepted the pattern of Church-State relations then emerging in the United States was clear when he alluded to the promise which civil and religious liberty held out and which, he said

> if we have the wisdom and temper to preserve, America may come to exhibit a proof to the world, that general and equal toleration, by giving a free circulation to fair argument, is the most effectual method to bring all denominations of christians to a unity of faith.[92]

---

[92] *An Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.* By a Catholic Clergyman [John Carroll] (Annapolis, 1784), p. 115.

A second difficulty which confronted Carroll as superior was the result of a number of causes. The prospect of freedom which the United States offered was not long in attracting men of various national backgrounds and ambitions to seek their fortune here. As a consequence the Catholics soon found their number augmented by both priests and laity from abroad, some of whom had very strange notions of how the Church should be governed in this new land. Moreover, the native Catholics had little if any idea of canon law, and a minority among them saw no reason why their congregations should not follow the custom of their Protestant neighbors by instituting self-government with only a remote control from ecclesiastical superiors. They had witnessed cases where Protestant ministers had struck the fancy of portions of a congregation by their preaching, had defied church authorities by creating a schism, and formed new bodies with the support of those who preferred their theology to that of the duly authorized ministers. A case in point was that of the Reverend William McClennachan who arrived in Philadelphia in 1759 and preached at Christ Church. The regular pastor, Dr. Robert Jenney, raised objections to McClennachan preaching without a license from the Bishop of London. But McClennachan's admirers countered that they considered McClennachan's election by the people and engagement by the vestry as sufficient authority, "whether he had the bishop's license or not, that the latter's permission meant nothing in Philadelphia without a 'previous presentation from the people.' "[93] The case dragged on for several years during which an Anglican convention in Pennsylvania decided against McClennachan, the Bishop of London denied him a license, and when the case was appealed the Archbishop of Canterbury also decided against him. But all of these official decisions did not prevent a mixed group of McClennachan's followers—Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Lutherans—from banding together in 1764 to form the new St. Paul's Church where the controversial minister carried on in defiance of the Church of England. This case, and others like it in these years, were widely publicized and had the two-fold effect of giving cause

[93] William M. Hogue, "The Church of England in the Northern Colonies and the Great Awakening," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Catholic University of America (1954), p. 225.

for worry to legitimate church authorities of all denominations and a desire for imitation among restless elements of their congregations.

In addition to the presence of nationalist rivalries on the part of certain foreign-born Catholics, to the example of autonomous rule in Protestant congregations, and to the inadequate faculties of Carroll as superior of the missions, there was the general spirit of freedom in the post-war years which threatened to get out of hand in many areas of national life. All these factors played their part in the rise of a movement within the Catholic Church which became the major problem of Carroll's lifetime, and which has been known as lay trusteeism. It was altogether natural that amid the uncertainties which still obtained concerning the place the Church would be permitted to occupy by the law of the several states and the national government that Catholic laymen should have taken the lead in securing legal incorporation of property for their churches. Nor was there anything in canon law to forbid such action, providing that the ultimate authority over appointment and removal of pastors were reserved to the bishop or to one acting in his stead. In fact, as Archbishop John Hughes said seventy years later of the lay trustees, "Regarded *a priori,* no system could appear to be less objectionable, or more likely both to secure advantages to those congregations, and at the same time to recommend the Catholic religion to the liberal consideration of the Protestant sentiment of the country."[94] Unfortunately, however, in a number of instances unruly factions in several Catholic congregations—abetted by refractory priests—went beyond mere incorporation of property and management of the temporalities and insisted on the right to hire and dismiss the priests. This was an infringement upon the right of the bishop, or his substitute, and constituted a clear violation of the traditional and hierarchical principle on which the Catholic Church was governed.

Two cases of this kind which Father Carroll was compelled to protest in the years before he was appointed a bishop occurred in New York and Philadelphia. In New York the trouble arose at St. Peter's Church, which was begun in 1784 as the city's first Catholic congregation, and where in the following year the parishioners split over the merits of two Irish Capuchins who fought for

[94] Lawrence Kehoe (Ed.), *The Complete Works of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop of New York* (New York, 1865), II, 550.

the mastery. One group gained the ascendancy and turned out the original priest and appeals were made to Carroll by both sides. In a letter of January, 1786, he reminded the contestants that they had no right to choose their priests at will, since such a practice would violate a fundamental law of the universal Church upon which its unity and catholicity were based. Carroll put his finger on one of the major causes behind these factional disputes when he stated that if this principle were admitted a zealous clergyman who tried to do his duty courageously without respect of persons would be liable to become the victim of his own efforts to halt the progress of vice and bad example. Another priest who was more compliant with the passions of some of the principal members of the congregation would then be sought as a substitute and the cause of religion would suffer. And Carroll concluded, "if the ecclesiastical superior has no control in these instances, I will refer to your own judgment what the consequences may be."[95] The superior's plea fell on deaf ears, however, and it was only in October, 1787, that a period of peace and obedience to Carroll's authority was ushered in at St. Peter's with the arrival of an able priest by the name of William O'Brien.

In Philadelphia it was not a case of mutually hostile groups enrolled beneath the banners of two rival Irish-born friars, but rather the emergence of German nationalist feeling in an English-speaking congregation. As the number of German Catholics increased they determined to have a church for those of their own nationality separate from St. Mary's, which at the time was in the charge of two English-born priests. In spite of the opposition of Fathers Robert Molyneaux and Francis Beeston, the Germans informed Carroll of their intentions and requested his permission to name their own priest. The superior of the missions tactfully replied that he was glad to note their spirit of submission to the lawful authority of the Church, and that he had informed several of their number on a previous occasion that he had in mind a German priest for them. He was careful to add, however, "As the Congregation of this place never before had the nomination of the Clergymen appointed to serve I now see no reason why I should depart from a right which has been always exercised by my prede-

[95] Carroll to the Trustees of St. Peter's Church, January 25, 1786, *American Catholic Historical Researches,* XVII (January, 1900), 2.

cessors."[96] But here, too, Carroll's efforts at pacification proved futile and after its first stormy years Holy Trinity Church, the first national parish of the Catholic Church in the United States, lapsed into schism in 1798 and was not restored to episcopal authority until early in 1802.

If the American Catholic clergy had at first been opposed to the idea of having a bishop, the objections of most of them were resolved by the troubles which had arisen in places like New York and Philadelphia. Three years of experience were more than enough to prove that John Carroll's faculties as superior of the missions were wholly inadequate to exercise the authority which the Church's traditional law demanded. By March, 1788, the priests were, therefore, ready to petition the Holy See for a bishop with the powers of an ordinary, and not merely those of a titular bishop or a vicar apostolic. They were the more encouraged to do so when the Protestant Episcopalians settled their lengthy agitation over the question of bishops by electing Samuel Provoost and William White, who sailed for England in November, 1786, to be consecrated for the new dioceses of New York and Pennsylvania.[97] In their petition the priests asked Pope Pius VI for permission to elect the bishop themselves, "at least for the first time." It was an unusual request, but it was an unusual situation, and after due consideration Cardinal Antonelli informed them on July 12, 1788, that they might proceed with recommendations for the proper place in which to locate the new diocese, and he stated that the pope, "as a special favour and for this first time,"[98] had granted permission for them to elect one of their number and forward his name to Rome for confirmation. The priests convened in May, 1789, and

[96] Carroll to Joseph Cauffman, November 24, 1787, Martin I. J. Griffin, "The Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia,* XXI (1910), 11.

[97] Speaking of the early difficulties of the Episcopalians to get bishops consecrated and priests ordained, Jameson says, "Dr. Franklin, with his curious inability to perceive religious distinctions, made an amusing attempt, through the papal nuncio in Paris, to see if a young correspondent of his could not be ordained in the Catholic Church without becoming a member of its communion." (*Op cit.,* p. 96.)

[98] John Carroll, Robert Molyneux, and John Ashton to Pius VI, March 12, 1788; Antonelli to Carroll, Molyneux, and Ashton, July 6, 1788, Guilday, *op. cit.,* I, 347-348; 352.

unanimously chose Baltimore as the seat of the bishopric while John Carroll received twenty-four votes out of the twenty-six cast for the first bishop. Their choices were confirmed by Pius VI and on November 6, 1789, the apostolic brief *Ex hac apostolicae* was issued in which the Bishop of Baltimore was given the full rights and powers pertaining to an ordinary rather than the limited faculties of a titular bishop or vicar apostolic.

The selections made by the clergy were in both instances good ones. Baltimore was rapidly forging ahead as the most important town in the state where most of the Catholics lived and by 1790 it had a population of 13,500. Carroll had clearly demonstrated his superiority as a wise and able administrator in very trying circumstances. Moreover, he came from a family that had been in this country for generations and that had won distinction for its patriotic service. "The religious views of this family," it has been said, "were as well known as was their Americanism. They had long fought the fight for religious freedom in Maryland, and their views were influential in determining the final character of American religious liberty."[99] John Carroll shared entirely the views of his more famous cousin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, on the political theory of separation of Church and State that was then slowly coming into being in this land of multiple religious beliefs. And in the quarter century that he ruled the See of Baltimore he was never found to change those views. During the 165 years since Carroll assumed the reins of authority over the infant Diocese of Baltimore there has never been a happier combination in a Catholic bishop of thoroughly loyal Catholicism and sterling Americanism—unless it be James Gibbons, his eighth successor at Baltimore—than was true of the first Bishop of Baltimore. He was in every sense an exemplary Catholic and a first-rate American.

What kind of a Church was it that John Carroll was called upon to govern? The best answer was provided by Carroll himself in a detailed report which he sent to the Holy See under the date of March 1, 1785. At that time he estimated that the number of Catholics was about 25,000 with the majority of those, 15,800, in Maryland, about 7,000 in Pennsylvania, around 200 in Virginia, and he had been told there were at least 1,500 in New York. Car-

[99] Edward Frank Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America, 1774-1789* (Boston, 1924), p. 237.

roll had also heard that there were many French-speaking Catholics in the country bordering on the Mississippi who were without priests, but of these he had no exact data. As for the occupations of the American Catholics, they were principally plantation owners and farmers in Maryland and Pennsylvania with a number of merchants and mechanics in Philadelphia. Of these he could speak with full knowledge, and he had words of praise for the manner in which they attended to their religious duties. But of the rapidly increasing number of foreign-born Catholics who were entering the United States, he could not say as much. While most of the native-born approached the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist at least once a year, "you can scarcely find any among the newcomers," said Carroll, "who discharge this duty to religion. . . ."[100]

At the time he wrote there were nineteen priests in Maryland and five in Pennsylvania, of whom a number were growing old and enfeebled. He had heard disconcerting reports about the conduct of one priest, and Carroll revealed his fine judgment when he stated that he would prefer to see a congregation without a priest rather than to have one who might give scandal. The priests derived their living mainly from the estates of the ex-Jesuits and there was as yet no ecclesiastical property in the proper sense of the term. There was no Catholic school in the United States, but Catholics were admitted to the College of Philadelphia,[101] and plans were being made to open St. John's College at Annapolis to which Catholics would likewise be admitted. Carroll hoped that out of the students who went to these institutions some future candidates for the priesthood might be found, but of that he was not overly optimistic since he concluded, "We think accordingly of establishing a Seminary, in which they can be trained to the life and learning suited to that state."[102]

[100] Carroll to Antonelli, March 1, 1785, Guilday, *op. cit.*, I, 226.

[101] The spirit which prevailed at the school which Franklin had founded in Philadelphia was well illustrated by the question which was asked of entering students: "Do you think any person ought to be harmed in his body, name, or goods for mere speculative opinions or his external way of worship?" (Beard, *op. cit.*, I, 169). Under the circumstances it was not surprising that Father Ferdinand Farmer should have been chosen as a trustee in 1779 and that Thomas FitzSimons should have served in a similar capacity a decade later.

[102] Guilday, *op. cit.*, I, 227.

All told the picture which Carroll drew of American Catholicism in 1785 was not a very impressive one, but in many ways the skies were clearing for the Catholics. They had escaped almost entirely from some of the evils which, for example, had beset the Episcopalians in recent years. They did not have to contend with destroyed church edifices, scattered congregations, and loyalist ministers in flight as had befallen their neighbors during and after the war. Moreover, by the close of 1776 the two states in which the Catholics were concentrated had given them their full rights as citizens. What was even more encouraging, two of their number had participated in the convention that had drawn up the Constitution for a national government, and therein it had been stated that no religious test should ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. This much had been accomplished by the time that John Carroll prepared to depart for England in the summer of 1790 for his consecration. A final step, of which he heartily approved, made progress during his absence, and when the first ten amendments to the Constitution came into effect on December 15, 1791, no one welcomed the first of these more warmly than Carroll and his Catholic people, announcing, as it did, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The federal government had pointed the way and before many years had passed the Catholics in places like New York, New England, and the South would share with their brothers of Maryland and Pennsylvania in equal rights as Americans.

After considering several other possibilities John Carroll finally decided to accept the invitation of his old English friend, Thomas Weld, to be consecrated in his chapel at Lulworth Castle. He sailed in July, 1790, and had as a fellow passenger James Madison who was going to England for his own consecration as the first Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Virginia. In the ceremony performed by Bishop Charles Walmesley, O.S.B., in the chapel of Weld's manorial estate on Sunday, August 15, the preacher was another old friend of Carroll's, Father Charles Plowden, like the bishop, a former Jesuit. Plowden could not help but contrast the position of the English Catholics at that moment with that of their American brethren. To date every effort to win justice at the hands of the British government had failed, for the first relief bill to give

them any substantial gains came only in June, 1791. Thus Plowden spoke against a background of painful experience when he remarked that the recent dismemberment of the British Empire had about it a providential character in calling into existence a new nation where men were equal and free. The national pride of the new bishop was doubtless deeply stirred when he heard the preacher say:

> For although this great event may appear to us to have been the work, the sport of human passion, yet the earliest and most precious fruit of it has been the extension of the kingdom of Christ, the propagation of the catholic religion, which heretofore fettered by restraining laws, is now enlarged from bondage and it is left at liberty to exert the full energy of divine truth.[103]

Bishop Carroll returned to the United States early in December, 1790, and was installed in St. Peter's Pro-Cathedral at Baltimore a few days later. Washington had been inaugurated as president a year and a half before, and thus the national government and the centralized administration of the Catholic Church were formally launched within a brief time of each other. Like all their fellow citizens, the Catholics were aware of what the new nation owed to Washington. Late in 1789 they had sought, therefore, to testify their esteem for him by sending the president an address in which they emphasized the great man's accomplishments and their prayerful wishes for his future as chief executive. The address was signed by Father Carroll for the clergy and by Charles and Daniel Carroll, Thomas FitzSimons, and Dominick Lynch for the laity. Washington's splendid example would be a powerful factor for the well being of the nation, for as they said, "You encourage respect for religion, and inculcate, by words and actions, that principle, on which the welfare of nations so much depends, that a superintending providence governs the events of the world, and watches over the conduct of men." The Catholics recalled their service to the revolutionary cause and rejoiced in the civil rights they had won in some states. They would pray for the preservation of these rights where they had been granted, and for the full extension of them in

[103] *American Catholic Historical Researches,* VII (October, 1890), 167, which reprints the brochure of J. P. Coghlan, *A Short Account of the Establishment of the New See of Baltimore, Maryland, and of Consecrating the Right Rev. Dr. John Carroll* (London, 1790).

those states that still restricted them. And in their prayers they would always remember Washington, for they could not conceive any human means more available to promote the welfare of the United States than the prolongation of his health and life, a life in which, as they said, "are included the energy of your example, the wisdom of your counsels, and the persuasive eloquence of your virtues."[104]

In his reply of March 12, 1790, Washington invoked the help of divine Providence in national affairs and expressed his gratification at the high opinion with which Americans of all denominations had honored him. As to the civil rights of Catholics, it was his belief that as men became more liberal they would be more apt to allow equal rights to all worthy members of the community, and in this respect he hoped to see America among the foremost nations of the world. He then stated:

> And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution, and the establishment of their government; nor the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic religion is professed.[105]

The exchange of compliments between the chief executive and his Catholic subjects had been a pleasant and heartening experience, and the latter could return thanks to God that their interests in Church and State were now in the hands of two such peerless leaders as Washington and Carroll. That, in itself, was a happy augury for their future.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[104] The Catholics to Washington [undated, late in 1789], Washington Papers, 334, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

[105] *Ibid.*, Washington to the Catholics, March 12, 1790, copy.

DIFFICULTIES OF THE TRANSLATOR

In every language there is much of twilight. At times, our very native tongue is hard to understand. Inseparable from the men who forge them are words and their conventional meanings, ideological signs and the signification attached thereto. And in men, at least in their common activity, there is a great deal of the fluid and the transient; or, to use a vaguer term now so much in vogue, there is in human actions a certain existential quality, a property not easy to pin down by way of definition. And that for the simple reason that activity is not static. It is difficult to put a clothes pin on a wind-blown shirt.

Human society exists only because a system of ideological signs, which we call language, has reality. With every variation in the intellectual and emotional life of human society, there seems to be a corresponding change in language, the medium of social intercommunication. Society is rocked by the convulsions of an emotional cataclysm, for example a global war; nearly overnight, it seems, the from-you-to-me and the from-me-to-you signs, which are human language, are rocked anew by the agitation involved in the consequent, stepped-up linguistic metabolism.

Not only the *Zeitgeist,* but also their space-location, with its attendant climatic and topographical differences, tends to produce linguistic diversity even among people of the same nation. This is obvious to one who has traveled a bit about his own native land. For example, some years ago, a field commission from one of our larger midwest universities, after an extensive survey, published some interesting data on words, their meaning and pronunciation, as used in different parts of the United States. The commission discovered that there were about a score of synonyms for what we, as boys, called just plain "fish worms," and, among other interesting facts, that the "s" in the word "greasy" was pronounced as a voiceless "s" north of a certain line running through Indiana, while south of that line the 's" was voiced as in "easy."

If there are such variations and consequent difficulties in the understanding of one's mother tongue, how much greater the difficulty in understanding exactly the language of another people and country. Those of us who have learned a foreign language *in situ,* so

to say, are fully aware of this. Day-in and day-out, we had to attend lectures given in a foreign tongue. Conversation was impossible, unless one forgot one's native language and, as it were, sank brain-deep in what were at first the not too clear waters of the other tongue.

Then, just when one felt that one had really entered into the genius of the new language, perhaps had even preached in the new medium, suddenly! a change of milieu, and a brand-new vocabulary to be learned. Perhaps, one *had* to spend a month in a hospital where sisters, nurses, and doctors spoke, say, only French. To be sure, one well knew that *garde-malade* meant "nurse." But, did one ever hear a doctor address a nurse, in the informal vocative, if you please, by "Garde-malade"? No, it was just plain "Mademoiselle." And so on, and so on.

Turning now to the proper subject of these paragraphs, the translation of Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*,[1] we find two principal difficulties which the translator will have to overcome. The first is the language problem, the second that of the peculiar nature of the theological documents themselves.

With regard to the matter of language, these documents are, for the most part, written in Latin, although a good number of them, especially the more ancient, are in Greek. One hears it said that Latin is a dead language and, consequently, a static medium of thought intercommunication, if one may speak of a so-called dead language as a means of communication between living people. But, whatever one may say about ancient, classical Latin, it is certainly not true that ecclesiastical Latin is a dead language. From the very beginning of the Church down to the present day, there has been growth and evolution in this language. And here a pitfall awaits the unwary translator, namely, the possibility of his applying to Latin words of 1500 years ago the meaning that these same words have today.

Again, the translation of Latin and, especially, Greek words may be faulty, if one does not know the theological controversies linked

[1] *Denzinger: The Sources of Catholic Dogma.* Translated by Roy J. Deferrari from the Thirtieth Edition of Henry Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1957), Pp. xxxiv + 653 + 67. $8.50.

to the history of such words. One has but to instance, for example, such Greek words as *ousia, physis, hypostasis,* and *prosōpon* to get some idea of the difficulties besetting the unwary translator of ecclesiastical documents.

Among the many difficulties encountered in translating technical theological writings, or more precisely, the written monuments of the Church's *magisterium,* is the fact that these documents are often enough found in Denzinger's *Enchiridion* quite detached from their historical and doctrinal context. And, unless the translator be conversant with this context, many errors may creep into his translation.

An analogous situation may clarify what I mean. Suppose a person comes into a room where a group of people are carrying on a lively conversation. Further, suppose the subject of the conversation is a technical subject with which the intruder is not overly familiar. Would it not be reasonable to believe that the newcomer would find it difficult, if not impossible, to pick up the conversation on the fly and explain the gist of every sentence uttered, starting at the precise moment when he first began to hear the words of the conversation? Surely, he would have to wait until the context of the subject under discussion were made clear. Similar is the difficulty of the translator of Denzinger, unless he be sufficiently acquainted with both the historical and doctrinal context from which the documents in the *Enchiridion* are often separated.

APPRAISAL OF THE DENZINGER TRANSLATION

First, let me assure the reader that the reputation of the translator of Denzinger's *Enchiridion* as a true scholar is not questioned. On that, no one will, I feel sure, disagree. And regard for and charity towards the learned Dr. Deferrari demand that I insist that the serious theological errors in this translation are caused by faulty proofreading and, especially, by the lack of a sufficiently careful theological scrutiny. They are in the translation, not precisely because of the fault of the translator, but rather because he could not have had the theological help which is requisite for one who is not a theologian, if such a one takes on the admittedly difficult task of translating technical theological documents. Every section of the translation should have been gone over carefully by a trained philosopher and theologian.

Among very many examples that could be cited, one very obvious place that shows the lack of theological scrutiny of the translation occurs in the translation of the definition of papal infallibility (n. 1839). Here we find *definit* translated by "explains," *pollere* by "operated," *instructam* by "instructed," and *ex sese* by "from himself."

Now, such errors would have been impossible for a theologian. First, regarding *definit,* which is translated as "explains." One who had taught the course *De ecclesia* in fundamental dogmatic theology would know that in Butler's *The Vatican Council,* II, 144, 132, there are to be found two things: (1) an English translation of the *Collectio lacensis,* VII, 474 f., where the *relator,* Gasser (incidentally, one of the most prominent men at the Vatican Council), explains what the council meant by *definit;* and (2) a complete translation of the definition. Furthermore, the theologian, knowing that here is defined the exact coextension of papal infallibility with that of the Church, would instinctively translate *pollere* correctly as "possesses" and *instructam* as "endowed" or "equipped" (with). And, finally, well aware that the *ex sese* was directed against the so-called *Gallicani mitiores* (who maintained that the papal definitions were not *of themselves* unchangeable, but needed the consequent consent of the Church in order to be immutable), the theologian would necessarily translate *ex sese,* not "from himself," but "of (from) themselves."

Again, one acquainted with the theological dispute that raged around the *Augustinus* and the five condemned propositions (nn. 1092-96) and one aware of the distinction brought up between the *quaestio facti* and *quaestio iuris,* would hardly translate the *in sensu ab . . . auctore intento* by "in the sense understood by the author." This savors too much of the purely subjective sense. The obvious translation is "intended," that is, "in sensu auctoris qua auctoris" ("sensus objectivo-subjectivus"). Also, it is unfortunate, indeed, that the *dumtaxat,* "only," was not translated (n. 1096), for its omission stamps a *de fide* statement as heretical.

In a translation of part of the *acta* of the Council of Florence (n. 691), we read "that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son *from whom He was moreover eternally begotten*" (italics mine). A case of omission, true; but a very serious one. To have the correct translation, insert after "Son," "this the Son Himself has eternally from the Father, from whom, etc."

In n. 797 the words of the Council of Trent, "neque homo ipse nihil omnino agat" are translated "man himself . . . does nothing at all," plainly the exact opposite of what the Council says. Again, in the Council of Florence (n. 703) "and all these things are one" is omitted before "where no opposition of relationship interferes." In the fourth Lateran Council (n. 432), the "non tamen aliud" is translated by "yet they are not different," where, obviously, to avoid any savor of Modalism or Sabellianism, one should translate "yet they are not a different reality."

In n. 149, "Over these you ruled as a head over the members *among those holding office*. . . ." (italics mine). The translation should read: "through those who held (or took) your place," that is, "through your legates." A glance at *Mansi,* VI, 146, *Synopsis,* I, "in suis legatis" and *ibid.,* Cap. I, 147 C., would have made this error impossible.

In these paragraphs, I have pointed out only a fractional part, and that, unfortunately, a very small one, of the doctrinal errors contained in this translation. Much as I regret it, I must warn the reader that there are errors throughout the book, from the *Humani generis* of Pope Pius XII to the Apostles' Creed, and these mismakes are to be found in all twenty ecumenical councils, as well as other documents of the *magisterium.* (It is obvious that I am speaking *only* of the English translation, when I speak of errors.)

One could begin with the last sentence of *Humani generis* (n. 2313), where "data opera" is translated by "after due consideration"; then one could go on to the "in a sense of the word historical" (n. 2302, last sentence), where the translation is the exact opposite of the original. Briefly alluding to Vatican (nn. 1839 and 1792), Trent (n. 797), one might mention that there is in Denzinger's Latin original only one item listed from the fifth Lateran Council (n. 738) and, even here, in the translation, the definition of the immortality of the soul is omitted. We have already mentioned the Council of Forence. And I could easily, but with fatigue to the reader of this review, go back to the very beginning of the translation, pointing out on the way a considerable number of errors in the English version of Denzinger.

In conclusion, what should one say? In justice to Dr. Deferrari, eminent in his own field, and, also, in justice to the readers of his translation, I should like to suggest the following: every section

of this translation should be checked for errors by a number of competent theologians. And that, before long. This matter is important, since there is here a question of the presentation in English translation of one of the most important sources of our common Catholic faith.

These documents are really the written monuments of the *magisterium* of the Church, primary written monuments of the primary organs of that living, sacred tradition which is the *praedicatio magisterii*. To a correct and exact presentation of their precious doctrinal heritage Catholics have a strict right. And the publishers of this translation have a corresponding obligation, in my opinion, to see that this right is recognized.

Until a complete correction of the many errors in this translation is achieved, I may not recommend this book. For it will but irritate the theologian and possibly harm others not versed in sacred doctrine.

MALACHI J. DONNELLY, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Marys, Kansas

DEVOTION TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY IN THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY EXHORTATIONS TO THE CATHOLIC PRIESTS

Over the course of the last forty years four Sovereign Pontiffs have directed four magnificent letters of direction to the priests within the Church militant of the New Testament. These letters are (1) the exhortation *Haerent animo,* published by St. Pius X on Aug. 4, 1908; (2) the encyclical *Humani generis,* issued by Pope Benedict XV on June 15, 1917; (3) the letter *Ad Catholici sacerdotii,* sent out on Dec. 20, 1935, by Pope Pius XI; and (4) the apostolic exhortation *Menti nostrae,* written by the present Holy Father during the Holy Year. The *Menti nostrae* is dated Sept. 23, 1950.[1]

Pope Benedict's *Humani generis* concentrates on the priestly work of preaching the revealed word of God. The other three deal directly with the nature and the obligations of the priestly state within the Catholic Church. Taken together, these documents form an authentic and absolutely effective guide to priestly spirituality and success. The priests of our own day, and of our own country, can be certain that their ministry will be fruitful and apostolic if they direct their activities and their lives according to the norms given to them in these four outstanding papal documents.

Each of these statements by the Vicar of Christ on earth mentions Our Lady. The reference to her in Pope Benedict's *Humani generis* is brief, even though tremendously enlightening. In the other three documents there is a more detailed reference to her, and to priestly devotion and piety towards her. Some appreciation of the references to Our Lady in these modern papal statements on priestly perfection is necessary for any adequate understanding of the contemporary status of mariology.

In the *Haerent animo,* St. Pius X expressed a great many hopes for the Catholic priests of his day, hopes which he set forth in the

[1] These four documents are translated in *The Popes and the Priesthood,* a Grail Publication, published by St. Meinrad's Abbey, St. Meinrad, Ind., in 1953. Citations in this article are taken from this edition.

form of a prayer, that God might sanctify them, and might lead them to utilize the means He had established for the holiness and the efficacy of their ministry. Speaking of these prayers, the great Saint of the twentieth century wrote:

> We wish to entrust Our prayers for you to the care of the great Virgin Mother, Queen of the Apostles, so that they may be more powerful. For she taught by her example those very happy fruits of the sacred order how to persevere united in prayer, until they were clothed with heavenly virtue; and she made that virtue much more abundant in them with the aid of her prayers, and she strengthened and fortified them with counsel, so that their labors were most happily fruitful.[2]

Thus the first lesson about Our Lady taught in the *Haerent animo* is the truth that prayers for blessings which are especially desired can be and should be entrusted to her, so that, through the power of her intercession with her Divine Son, these petitions may be more effective before God. Throughout the years he acted as the successor of the Prince of the Apostles in teaching and governing the Church, St. Pius X instructed the faithful, not only in the way of actually presenting divinely revealed teaching, but also by the force of his example. Here in this exhortation to his beloved priests he manifested the power of his example with a special clarity.

The desire or hope St. Pius X expressed in his prayer for the priests of the Catholic Church was one which he thus described. "Above all else has the desire been dominant in Our mind, that those who have been raised to the high station of the sacred ministry might be found to walk worthily of the great dignity of their office."[3] The benefit which St. Pius X wanted "above all else" was precisely the benefit he begged of God in a prayer which he not only poured forth to God, but which he also commended to the care and the intercession of the Blessed Virgin.

By this procedure, St. Pius X certainly encouraged and influenced the priests to whom and for whom he was writing to confide to the Blessed Virgin their own prayers for the objectives nearest and dearest to them, the petitions to God for the success of their priestly lives and activities. By the force of his example he thus helped the priests of the Church to realize and to appreciate the power of Mary's intercession in their behalf, and her willingness

[2] *The Popes and the Priesthood*, p. 27. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

to work for the attainment of the objectives of the Catholic priesthood.

The allusion in the text of the *Haerent animo* to Our Lady's teaching the first disciples "how to persevere united in prayer, until they were clothed with heavenly virtue" is obviously a reference to the first chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles*. There we read that, immediately after Our Lord's Ascension into heaven, St. Peter and the other ten apostles "were persevering with one mind in prayer, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren."[4]

In the gathering described in the text of the *Acts,* Our Lady was obviously the most perfect spiritually, and the closest of all to Our Saviour. It is obvious that the unity of the disciples was something which was brought and preserved, in some measure, by reason of her influence and activity.

Now the text of the *Haerent animo* shows that St. Pius X was particularly anxious to encourage "a closer union among priests." The great Pope who unmasked and denounced the poisonous errors of Modernism insisted that the priests of the Church should show, in their own lives and in their own attitudes towards one another, their obedience to the command Our Lord enjoined most insistently upon His followers: "A new commandment I give unto you; That you love one another, as I have loved you, that you also love one another."[5]

St. Pius X knew very well that, if and when this mutual and powerful affection of divine charity exists among the members of Our Lord's true Church, and particularly among the priests of His Church, God's glory will be furthered in a way that could never be possible otherwise. He worked, prayed, and labored for the attainment of that unity in charity. And he realized that, just as the indescribably powerful charity of the first Christians and of the first apostles had been realized and exercised only in the presence of Mary and with her aid, the corporate and charitable solidarity of the Catholics and the priests of the twentieth century will be furthered and aided only by her goodness and intercession.

* * * * *

[4] *Acts,* 1:14.

[5] *John,* 13:34; see also *John,* 15:12, 17.

One of the golden books of the Catholic priesthood in this century is the encyclical *Humani generis,* written by Pope Benedict XV to guide the priests of the Church towards a more fruitful preaching of the revealed word of God. It is as practical and effective today as it was at the moment of its publication, forty years ago. Indeed, the very difficulties and evils about which it speaks are still those which threaten the effectiveness of Catholic preaching in our own generation.

In the conclusion of his Encyclical, Pope Benedict XV, like his saintly predecessor in the Chair of Peter, commended his prayer for his priests and for the Church itself to the intercession of Our Lady.

> Through the intercession, therefore, of the most Holy Virgin, the August Mother of the Incarnate Word Himself, and the Queen of the Apostles, may Jesus Christ the merciful and everlasting Shepherd of souls vouchsafe to look down with favor on His flock, fill the clergy with the apostolic spirit, and grant that there may be many who will strive eagerly to present themselves to God approved workmen that cannot be ashamed, rightly handling the word of truth.[6]

Interestingly enough, in their petitions, both St. Pius X and Pope Benedict XV appeal to Our Lady as the Blessed Virgin, as Mother, and as Queen of the Apostles. In giving her this last title, they were obviously taking cognizance of the fact that the intense charity of Mary, more powerful than that of any other creature, impels her to desire and to work for the objectives sought by Our Lord Himself in His Church. The office and the function of the apostle within the Church of God are orientated to the attainment of the end willed by Our Lord for His kingdom, the glory of the Triune God to be achieved through the salvation and the sanctification of men. Mary, in seeking and in working for that objective more powerfully and effectively than any other creature, is truly the Queen of the apostolic college and of the apostolic work throughout the world.[7] Pope Benedict's *Humani generis* and the *Haerent animo* of St. Pius X teach us by example that the assistance in the apostolic work to which God has called us can be aided immeasur-

[6] *The Popes and the Priesthood,* p. 38.

[7] Cf. Fenton, "Our Lady's Queenly Prerogatives," in *AER,* CXX, 5 (May, 1949), 425-30.

ably if we acknowledge this prerogative of Mary and appeal to her intercession by the use of this title.

* * * * *

The immensely practical spirituality of Pope Pius XI shows forth in his magnificent *Ad Catholici sacerdotii,* and particularly in the teaching about devotion to Our Lady found in this document. The strong Pope who ruled the Church militant in the period between the two world wars insisted upon the necessity of the virtue of piety in the priest.

> But remark, Venerable Brethren, the piety of which We speak is not that shallow and superficial piety which attracts but does not nourish, is busy but does not sanctify. We mean that solid piety which is not dependent upon changing mood or feeling. It is based upon principles of sound doctrine; it is ruled by staunch convictions; and so it resists the assaults and the illusions of temptation. This piety should primarily be directed towards God our Father in Heaven; yet it should be extended also to the Mother of God. The priest even more than the faithful should have devotion to Our Lady, for the relation of the priest to Christ is more deeply and truly like that which Mary bears to her Divine Son.[8]

These words of the *Ad Catholici sacerdotii* have a tremendously important meaning which does not become immediately evident through a merely literal translation of the text itself. The Sovereign Pontiff declared that the solid and supernatural *pietas* of the priest should be directed primarily towards God Our Father, and that it should also be extended to Our Lady, the Mother of God. Now in the terminology of St. Thomas Aquinas, the one employed by the Church's *magisterium* in the presentation of these theological truths, *pietas* is a potential part of the virtue of justice. It is the virtue by which we tend to render to our parents, the ones from whom we have received the gift of life, what is due to them. *Pietas* differs from justice itself only because, by the very nature of things, the debt due to our parents can never be paid *ad aequalitatem.* It is thus something on the general level of religion, *observantia,* and similar virtues described in the *Summa theologica.*

Thus, in teaching that priests should "extend" their piety to Our Lady, the *Ad Catholici sacerdotii* is asserting that they should honor

[8] *The Popes and the Priesthood,* p. 53.

and reverence her as their Mother in the supernatural order, and that they should strive, by every means within their power, to render her all the honor, obedience, and recognition she deserves.

This priestly *pietas* with reference to Our Lady would obviously and immediately involve an effort to learn and to meditate upon the basic truths of Mary's spiritual maternity with regard to Our Lord's Mystical Body. *Pietas,* like all the other virtues in its class, is something which presupposes knowledge. It would be impossible for us to thank Our Lady and to honor her for her spiritual maternity unless we were aware of the divinely revealed teachings in terms of which she stands manifested as our mother in Christ.[9]

It also involves a willingness to acknowledge our debt of gratitude and recognition to her. Mary's spiritual motherhood is something which exists dependently upon the transcendent and primary truth of God's spiritual fatherhood of His people, of the dignity of the adopted children of God. But, in the light of this primary truth, the dignity of Mary's spiritual parenthood of her Son's Mystical Body and its members is seen as a reality which men must acknowledge and love.

The *Ad Catholici sacerdotii* mentions Our Lady in still another context, that of the priestly virtue of chastity. The encyclical reminds its readers that "The Divine Master showed such high esteem for chastity, and exalted it as something beyond the common power; He Himself was the Son of a Virgin Mother, *Florem Matris Virginis;* and was brought up in the virgin family of Joseph and Mary . . ."[10]

In this way the document taught the priests to look to Our Lady as a model of the very virtue which they themselves are bound to observe. The perfect chastity to which they are bound by ecclesiastical law or by vow is in itself an imitation of the perfect chastity practiced by Our Lady herself.

* * * * *

The *Menti nostrae* issued by the present Holy Father during the never-to-be-forgotten Holy Year of 1950 develops the teachings set

[9] Cf. Fenton, "Devotion to the Blessed Virgin," in *AER,* CXXXV, 2 (Aug., 1956), 125-33.

[10] *The Popes and the Priesthood,* p. 54. The same document teaches that a true Christian home will instill into the children "a tender devotion to Jesus, the Blessed Sacrament, and the Immaculate Virgin" (*Ibid.,* p. 71).

forth in the writings of his predecessors. The *Menti nostrae* bids the priests of the Church to place their confidence in Our Lady's protection in their prayers and efforts to preserve their sacerdotal chastity. "Therefore, trusting in the protection of the Virgin Mother of God, generously make every effort to preserve yourselves 'clean, unstained, pure, and chaste, as becomes the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God.' "[11]

It also insists upon the necessity of a genuine devotion to Our Lady in the spiritually successful Catholic priest. The *Menti nostrae,* however, points out one definite way in which that devotion should be expressed.

> Inasmuch as priests can be called by a very special title, sons of the Virgin Mary, they will never cease to love her with an ardent piety, invoke her with perfect confidence, and frequently implore her strong protection. So that every day, as the Church herself recommends, they will recite the holy rosary, which, by proposing for our meditation the mysteries of the Redeemer, leads us "to Jesus through Mary."[12]

What Pope Pius XII recommends to his priests is nothing more or less than a complete expression of the *pietas* which they, as the recipients of Our Lord's favors, are obligated to have for His Blessed Mother. They are obligated to believe that Mary is deserving of a strong and special affection, and they must actually have that love of charity for her. They must take cognizance of the fact that she is in a position to intercede for us, and they must manifest the sincerity of that belief by actually seeking her intercession.

In urging the priests to follow the counsel of the Church and recite the rosary daily, the *Menti nostrae* refers explicitly to the benefits that follow from the meditation which is an integral part of this devotion to Our Lady. The Holy Father had taught in this same letter that "the priest cannot acquire dominion over himself and his senses, cannot purify his spirits, cannot strive for virtue as he should, cannot, in brief, fulfill faithfully, generously, or fruitfully the duties of his sacred ministry, unless his life becomes one with the life of the Lord through assiduous and unceasing meditation on the mysteries of the Divine Redeemer, the supreme model of perfection and the inexhaustible source of sanctity."[13]

[11] *Ibid.,* pp. 83 f. [12] *Ibid.,* p. 92. [13] *Ibid.,* p. 91.

Integrated into the prayers which together constitute the rosary of Our Lady are meditations on fifteen of the mysteries of our salvation. The person who prays the rosary properly, following the directives of the Church itself, thus adverts to each of these mysteries during the course of his prayer to God through Mary.

The meditation of prayer is something quite distinct from merely theological consideration. In the process of prayer, the person worshipping God through this great act of religion considers what God has taught on the subject of these mysteries of salvation through and in His Church, and he utilizes this knowledge in the formation and the perfecting of his own petitions to God.[14] The petitions of the rosary are those of the Our Father, the Hail Mary, and of the doxology. In the Hail Mary, we simply ask Our Lady to pray or intercede for us, now, and at the hour of our death. In the doxology we ask that the glory of the Triune God be accomplished. In the *Pater,* the distinctive prayer of the Church militant of the New Testament, we ask for the things we need for our contribution to God's glory, and ultimately for God' glory itself. Thus, in its petitions and in the meditations it contains, the rosary is an instrument of salvation and sanctification of inestimable worth. It is thus that the Church commends this prayer to her priests, and thus that the *Menti nostrae* is at pains to confirm and repeat this counsel.

Pope Pius XII urges his priests to join a devotion to Our Lady to their love for the Blessed Sacrament. He insists, furthermore, that this devotion should be cultivated by the priest during the earliest years of his priesthood, and from his years as a seminarian.

> These and all the other priestly virtues can be easily acquired and firmly possessed by seminarians if from the beginning they have acquired and cultivated a sincere and tender devotion to Christ Jesus present "truly, really, and substantially" in our midst in the most august Sacrament, and if they make of Him the inspiration and the end of all their actions and their aspirations. And, if to devotion to the Blessed Sacrament they unite filial devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, full of truth and abandonment to the Mother of God and urging the soul to imitate her virtues, then the Church will be supremely happy, because the fruit of an ardent and zealous ministry can never be

---

[14] Cf. Fenton, *The Theology of Prayer* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1939).

wanting in a priest whose adolescence has been nourished with the love of Jesus and Mary.[15]

The assertion that the fruit of an ardent and zealous ministry will always be found in a priest who has begun his ministry with a sincere love for Our Lord and His Blessed Mother is a strong, even a striking, statement. Yet it is eminently justified. The love for Our Lady which is founded upon and which is demanded by the affection of charity for her Divine Son is something in the order of intention. Indeed, as far as the sacerdotal life is concerned, it is something that belongs to the department of the basic and guiding intention. What a man does in the holy priesthood is dependent, through the power of God's grace, upon what he intends to do in God's service. The man who actually intends to work as a priest in God's Church for the promotion of Our Lord's own objectives will, by the power of divine grace, actually strive for the accomplishment of those objectives. His recognition of Our Lady's dignity and of her place in the supernatural order, and his affection for her, is an indication of the genuineness of his affection for Our Lord Himself. The work he does in the direction of carrying out that intention must be the labor of an ardent and zealous priestly ministry.

The *Menti nostrae* incorporates into its final exhortation one of the most touching and effective passages about Mary and the priest to be found anywhere in the official documents of the Catholic *magisterium*. Pope Pius XII thus speaks to his priests.

> When you meet very serious difficulties in the path of holiness and the exercise of your ministry, turn your eyes and your mind trustfully to her who is the Mother of the Eternal Priest and therefore the loving Mother of all Catholic priests. You are well aware of the goodness of this Mother. In many regions you have been the humble instruments of the mercy of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in wonderfully reviving the faith and charity of the Christian people.
>
> Our Lady loves everyone with a most tender love, but she has a particular predilection for priests who are the living image of Jesus Christ. Take comfort in the thought of the love of the Divine Mother for each of you and you will find the labors of your sanctification and priestly ministry much easier.

---

[15] *The Popes and the Priesthood*, p. 107.

To the Beloved Mother of God, mediatrix of heavenly graces, We entrust the priests of the whole world in order that, through her intercession, God will vouchsafe a generous outpouring of His Spirit which will move all ministers of the altar to holiness and, through their ministry, will spiritually renew the face of the earth.

Trusting in the powerful patronage of the Immaculate Virgin Mary as far as the realization of these wishes is concerned, We implore an abundance of divine graces on all, but especially on the Bishops and priests who suffer persecution, imprisonment, and exile because of their dutiful defence of the rights and the freedom of the Church.[16]

Thus, in the *Menti nostrae,* the present Holy Father summarizes all that his illustrious predecessors have written about the place of Our Lady in the life of the Catholic priest. He begs his priests to love her, to honor her, and to pray for her intercession. He acknowledges that the good they wish to do in the cause of Jesus Christ will be accomplished through the graces that God will shower on them because of her intercession in their behalf. He reminds the priests that Our Lady loves them with a special love for the sake of Our Lord Himself. And he shows them that they are to love and cherish her because they are called upon to love and serve Him. He makes it clear that the priest who lives up to the requirements of the Catholic Church is a priest devoted to Mary.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 115.

Answers to Questions

THE CHURCH *IS* OUR LORD'S MYSTICAL BODY

Question: In the question and answer department of a very prominent Catholic magazine the following paragraph appeared a short time ago. "The Church as a visible society consists of a body and a soul. In the body of the Church are all those who bear the name Catholic. From this part of the Church non-Catholics of all description are excluded. However, there is a soul to the Church, and that soul is the Mystical Body of Christ. Only those who are in the state of grace at this moment belong to the Mystical Body of Christ and the Communion of Saints."

Is this acceptable Catholic doctrine?

Answer: Objectively the passage cited by our questioner constitutes a denial rather than an expression of true Catholic doctrine. The writer from whom he quotes represents the Church as composed of two parts. One of these, which the writer calls the "body of the Church," he designates explicitly as a "part of the Church." As this writer describes it, this "body of the Church" is made up of "all those who bear the name Catholic." Likewise our writer asserts that only Catholics are members of this group. By the very fact that a man is a non-Catholic, he is not a part of this company.

The other "part" of the true Church is, according to our writer, the "soul" of the Church. He describes this "soul" of the Church as composed exclusively of "those who are in the state of grace at this moment." And he applies the name 'Mystical Body of Christ," not to the Church itself, but to this "part" of the Church. Furthermore he represents this "soul" of the Church as constituting the entity indicated in the Apostles' Creed as "the Communion of Saints."

Now the social unit which our writer describes as a "part" of the true Church and which he calls the "body of the church" is nothing more or less than the Catholic Church itself. It is the society which the old theologians and canonists defined in terms of its membership as "the congregation of the faithful" and as "the

assembly of the Catholics." The encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi,* issued fourteen years ago, described these members as persons "who have received the laver of regeneration and profess the true faith, and who have neither miserably separated themselves from the fabric of the Body nor have been separated from it by legitimate authority by reason of very serious offenses." The encyclical, however, asserted likewise that these people "alone must be considered as members of the Church." It definitely excludes the possibility that they might be considered as members of a part of the Church.

Furthermore, the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* not only designated the Church itself (and not merely some part of the Church) as truly the Mystical Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ, but it taught explicitly that the Church itself can rightly be defined as Our Lord's Mystical Body. "To define and describe this true Church of Christ—which is the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church—we can find nothing nobler, nothing more eminent, nothing more divine than the statement by which this Church is called 'the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.' "

The erroneous distinction between the visible Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ proved to have deep roots. Hence, seven years after the publication of the *Mystici Corporis Christi* Pope Pius XII was forced to repeat and to insist upon the truth he had stated so brilliantly in that encyclical. He listed, in the *Humani generis,* among the "poisonous fruits" that had been produced by the theological novelties condemned in his document the fact that "Some people judge that they are not bound by the doctrine set forth a few years ago in Our encyclical [the *Mystici Corporis Christi*] and based on the sources of revelation, to the effect that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Catholic Church are one and the same thing."

Now, seven years after the publication of the *Humani generis,* the error twice strongly and clearly reproved and corrected by the Holy Father has been proposed again to the faithful in the guise of Catholic teaching. Thousands of people who read a very prominent Catholic periodical have found in it statements about Our Lord's Mystical Body that are completely opposed to the clear and insistent pronouncements of the *Mystici Corporis Christi* and the *Humani generis* on this subject. They have been told that Our

Lord's Mystical Body is not the Church itself, but the "soul" of the Church. They have been led to imagine that only the people who are in the state of grace belong to or are members of the Mystical Body of Christ. If the readers take this teaching seriously and accept it as true, they will definitely suffer a great spiritual loss.

What makes this situation all the more deplorable is the very obvious fact that such contradictions to the clear and strongly expressed teachings of the Catholic *magisterium* are made and published in "good faith." No one would imagine for a moment that the writer of the paragraph cited by our questioner actually wanted to deny a doctrinal statement by the Roman Pontiff. No one could believe that the editor of the magazine and his staff would ever consciously co-operate in publishing assertions that contradict papal pronouncements of Christian teaching. Carelessness, not malice, was manifestly responsible for the writing and the publication of this travesty on Catholic doctrine.

Yet that carelessness in itself clearly stems from an all-too-widespread lack of interest in the purity and integrity of the Church's teaching. It reflects an attitude that represents doctrinal accuracy as a matter of "fine points" with which only the Church authorities and the Church's theologians need to be concerned. The cure for this attitude is to be found, incipiently at least, in a prayerful consideration of the teaching of the *Humani generis* on the doctrinal authority of papal encyclicals. The truths set forth in these documents, the *Humani generis* assures us, "are taught in the ordinary *magisterium,* to which the statement 'He who hears you, hears me,' is validly applied."

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

HOLY SATURDAY LITANY

Question: Last year our congregation joined in the singing of the responses of the litany at the Vigil Service on Holy Saturday night. We found it rather difficult for them since they were instructed to double the petitions of the litany. Would it be permissible not to double the petitions of the litany?

Answer: Our inquirer has been misinformed about the litany recited or chanted at the Vigil Service. The directives tell us specifically that the petitions of the litany are not doubled.

CHOICE OF OFFICE DURING LENT

Question: During Lent we are free to choose the ferial office or the office of the Saint of the day. Are we free to select the ferial office even though we choose the Mass of the Saint, as, on March 7, the Mass of St. Thomas?

Answer: The directive concerning the above question reads: "On the ferias of Lent and Passiontide, from Ash Wednesday to the Saturday before Palm Sunday, when any feast occurs which is not of the first or second class, both the office (in private recitation) and the Mass may be said of the feria or of the feast." Bugnini in his commentary does not state that the Mass and the office chosen must correspond. Thus we are free to choose, for example, the Mass of the Saint whose feast occurs and the office of the feria. This concession is granted "only, however, in private recitation, that is, not choral."

A PROBLEM ABOUT FUNERALS

Question: What is the correct position in church of a corpse of a priest and a corpse of a layman?

Answer: The Sacred Congregation of Rites directs that the bodies of the dead are placed in church with their feet towards the main altar, except priests, who have their head towards the main altar.

LOCKS AND THE BAPTISTRY

Question: We are constructing a new baptistry and the problem has come up of placing a lock on the font proper and also on the gate leading to the baptistry. Are both necessary?

Answer: Monsignor Collins (*The Church Edifice and Its Appointments*), quoting the *Rituale Romanum* (tit. II, caput I, n. 46) states that the entrance to the baptistry should be kept locked. Later on in discussing the font itself he says that "the font should be under lock and key, which means that either the lid of the font or the door to the baptistry ought to be locked." O'Connell (*Church Building and Furnishing*) implies that if the font is locked, it is not absolutely necessary to have the grille or gates of the entrance to the baptistry under lock and key. However, he directs that it is better to keep the baptistry locked to "preserve this hallowed place from any irreverence."

THE *UMBRELLINO*

Question: Kindly give a few specifications about the *umbrellino* that we are directed to use in the Holy Week ceremonies.

Answer: It is like a large white umbrella and may be collapsible. It is usually made of white silk or some other rich fabric like gold or silver cloth and decorated with a fringe. Some are even decorated with sacred symbols signifying the Eucharist.

THE *COLLECTIO RITUUM*

Question: I have heard that the blessings in Part II of the new *Collectio rituum* could not be used in the vernacular. Please let me know just what privileges we have concerning the use of the *Collectio.*

Answer: In dioceses where the Ordinary has granted permission to priests to use the Collectio these rules may be followed:

(a) If the English version is placed next to the Latin text, it suffices to say the prayers in English.

(b) If the English version is not printed alongside the Latin, it means that the priest must say those prayers in Latin, but before or after the Latin, he may say the prayers also in English, using the English text printed at the bottom of the page.

(c) It is not permitted to use the English translation for the part of the Nuptial Blessing that is read during the Holy Sacrifice

of the Mass. Only the customary Latin form may be used whenever the Nuptial Blessing is given *intra Missam.*

THE SOLEMN VOTIVE MASS

Question: What are the conditions required for a solemn votive Mass? We would like to have a votive Mass in honor of the Holy Spirit at the opening of our school year.

Answer: There is no problem if the votive Mass is to be said on a day when votive Masses are permitted. To offer a solemn votive Mass on any other day requires (a) the permission of the Ordinary and for a grave, and at the same time public reason; (b) it must be celebrated with extrinsic solemnity and at least a sung Mass and if possible a Solemn High Mass; (c) it must be offered in the presence of a large gathering.

A MASS RUBRIC

Question: Does the priest going to or from the sacristy to the main altar genuflect when passing a side altar, after the elevation of the Mass at the side altar?

Answer: Father O'Connell directs that where a Mass is in progress between the Consecration and the Communion, a priest passing to or from the sacristy makes a simple genuflection.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

COUNTRY OR CONSCIENCE?

Question: One of the questions sometimes put to Catholics in the United States is this: "In the event that there was a conflict between the laws of our country and the teachings of the Catholic Church, which would you obey?" What reply should a Catholic give to this query?

Answer: The question quoted by our correspondent is often intended to put Catholics in a situation in which they can be blamed,

whatever answer they may give. If they answer that they would obey the civil law, they will be told that they are not consistent with the principles of the Catholic faith; if they answer that they would obey the teachings of the Church, they will be accused of disloyalty to their country.

I believe that the best rejoinder to this question is to question the interrogator: "What would you do if a civil law was passed that would be contrary to the law of God as your conscience dictates?" If the person questioned answers that under all circumstances he would regard the civil law as superior to every other form of legislation—in other words, if he accepts the principle "My country, right or wrong"—there would not be much advantage in arguing with him, since there is no common ground on which a discussion can be conducted. But I do not believe that there are many Americans who follow such an extreme view.

Most of the citizens of our land accept the principle that in a conflict between civil legislation and the divine law, this latter should be given precedence. Actually, we put this principle into operation several years ago, to refute some of the Nazi war criminals. For, when they claimed that they performed acts of cruelty because they were commanded to do so by their civil laws or by their superiors, they were told that there is a higher law (the law which is called the natural law by Catholics) which must be obeyed, even when it is contrary to the civil laws or the laws of superiors. Most of the citizens of our land accept this principle, whatever be their religious beliefs.

However, there is a divergence of views as to the way in which the law of God is to be discovered. The Protestant citizen believes that his own private judgment should interpret the divine law as to what is right and what is wrong. The Catholic citizen believes that the law of God is properly interpreted by the Catholic Church. But both agree on the fundamental principle that when it is certain that a civil law is opposed to the law of God as one's properly formed conscience dictates, the law of God takes precedence.

Some of our fellow citizens seem to fear that this Catholic attitude could result in a wholesale rejection of civil legislation in favor of ecclesiastical law. They visualize the Pope telling Catholics that they must vote for certain candidates or certain measures or insisting on special favors for the Catholic Church. All this, of

course, is absurd. The teachings of the Catholic faith will never interfere with the civic duties and rights of American Catholics. On the contrary, Catholic principles furnish the most effective protection to the democratic institutions of our land and promote the loyalty of our citizens. Thus, the recent statement of Pope Pius XII to the effect that a war of defense is justifiable and that a Catholic may not on the grounds of conscience object to serve in such a war endowed with the requisite conditions is surely a protection against erroneous forms of pacificism.

However, if some legislative act were passed in our land which the Church would officially declare contrary to the law of God, Catholics would accept the decision of their Church. For example, if any state legalized "mercy killing" (and attempts are being made to pass such a measure in some of our states) Catholics would be bound in conscience to refuse all participation in this procedure, which is simply murder. Thus, a Catholic judge would not be permitted to authorize the killing of a sick person, a Catholic doctor would not be allowed to administer a lethal drug, even though this were commanded by state law or civil officials. Catholics should not hesitate to explain these principles to their non-Catholic fellow citizens. We are not ashamed to declare our stand—that in the event of a conflict between civil law and God's law as authoritatively declared by our Church, we should give preference to God's law.

THE MORE FREQUENT USE OF THE VIATICUM

Question: Since Holy Communion as Viaticum may be received by anyone in danger of death, no matter what may be the cause of the danger, does it not seem that many Catholics who may and should receive the Blessed Sacrament in such circumstances are not aware of their right and obligation in this respect?

Answer: Our questioner has brought up a point which, if logically followed out, would bring about a much more frequent administration of Holy Communion as Viaticum. Certainly, in modern life there are many persons who, for one reason or another, are placed in probable danger of death, and yet seem utterly unaware of their right and duty to receive Holy Communion as Viaticum. (If a person has received Holy Communion shortly before as a

devotional act he *may* receive the Blessed Sacrament as Viaticum, but is not *bound* to do so.) Examples of those who may, and *per se* should receive Holy Communion as Viaticum are the woman about to give birth to a child when the delivery is likely to be hazardous, the pilot preparing to test a new and risky type of jet plane, the rescue man going into a mine to save some entrapped miners, the policeman assigned to pursue and capture a dangerous criminal, etc. As is evident, on some occasions such persons have not the time or the opportunity to receive Holy Communion; but if it is reasonably possible, they should be fortified by the Holy Sacrament of Our Lord's Body and Blood. It should be remembered that there is no obligation to observe the eucharistic fast before the reception of the Viaticum.

A NOURISHING DRINK ON A FAST DAY

Question: On a fast day may one take between meals a malted milk or a milk shake?

Answer: It is the common teaching of theologians that liquids that are very nourishing may not be taken between meals on fast days, while those that furnish only slight nourishment are permitted. To the former class belong soup and cream, to the latter belong tea and coffee. (Cf. e.g. Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology,* II, 429.) Theologians have given divergent decisions regarding milk and undiluted fruit juices. When those bishops of the United States who have accepted the relative norm of fasting sent out their directives several years ago, they expressly stated that in their dioceses milk and fruit juices may be taken between meals. But this ruling may not be extended to liquids that are considerably more nourishing; and to this category surely belong the milk shake and the malted milk, as these drinks are ordinarily made. Hence, even where the bishop has accepted the relative norm of fasting, these drinks must be regarded as forbidden between meals.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

Since Jan. 6, 1953, the legislation on the Eucharistic fast has been that of the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* and of the Holy Office Instruction issued and published with that document. This legislation was quite complicated. The Holy Father, on January 19 of this year, issued a new directive on this subject in the form of a *Motu proprio*. The new legislation reads as follows:

(1) Ordinaries of places, excluding vicars general who are not in possession of a special mandate, may permit Holy Mass to be celebrated every day after midday, should this be necessary for the spiritual welfare of a considerable number of the faithful.

(2) Priests and faithful, before Holy Mass or Holy Communion, respectively, must abstain for three hours from solid foods and alcoholic beverages, and for one hour from non-alcoholic beverages. Water does not break the fast.

(3) From now on, the fast must be observed for the period of time indicated in n. 2 [above] even by those who celebrate or receive Holy Communion at midnight or in the first hours of the day.

(4) The infirm, even if not bedridden, may take non-alcoholic beverages and that which is really and properly medicine, either in liquid or solid form, before Mass or Holy Communion without any time limit.

We strongly exhort priests and faithful who are able to do so to observe the old and venerable form of the Eucharistic fast before Mass and Holy Communion. All those who will make use of these concessions must compensate for the good received by becoming shining examples of a Christian life and principally with works of penance and charity.

The dispositions of this *Motu proprio* will go into effect on March 25, 1957, the Feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Every disposition whatsoever to the contrary is abrogated, even if it be worthy of special mention.

In the next issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* we hope to publish the full translation of the *Motu proprio* together with that of the Commentary by Cardinal Ottaviani. The Commentary was published with the text of the *Motu proprio* in *Osservatore Romano.*

The Pontifical Roman Theological Academy, founded by Pope Clement XI in 1718 and recently restored by Pope Pius XII, held

its first meeting in January of this year. In line with its new constitution, the ordinary membership of the Academy is limited to forty theologians. Twenty of these members are from Rome itself, ten from Italy outside of Rome, and ten from outside Italy. One of the non-Italian members is Msgr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, Professor of Fundamental Dogmatic Theology at The Catholic University of America and editor of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. The newly restored Academy is to work for the furtherance of theological studies throughout the world. For the attainment of that end, it will publish a review, establish a research library for theologians, and organize theological congresses.

At the request of His Eminence Valerio Cardinal Valeri, President of the Pontifical Organization for Increased Religious Vocations, His Holiness has composed a prayer for plentiful vocations to the religious life. The Holy Father read this prayer over the Vatican Radio on February 11, the second anniversary of the Pontifical Institute of Religious Vocations. Attached to the prayer is an indulgence of ten years, for every time it is recited, and a plenary indulgence to be gained once a month, under the usual conditions, if it is recited daily for a month.

In keeping with his world-wide interest in all peoples Pope Pius XII in an audience on January 19, with Britain's Foreign Minister, Selwyn Lloyd, stated that he admired the "courage and sense of solidarity with which the British have always shown themselves ready for sacrifice and magnificent self-discipline when demanded by the common good." The Holy Father then continued: "We are as fully aware as are you, Right Honorable Sir, that today an unusually heavy responsibility rests on the foreign ministries of nations for the peoples whose interests they are charged to safeguard and develop. We want to assure you and your colleagues of our prayerful good wishes for your success."

On January 21, Capranica College welcomed back its most illustrious alumnus, His Holiness Pope Pius XII, when he paid it a private visit in observance of its fifth centenary. The Pope passed through the same stone doorway he had entered in 1894 as a 16-year-old youth to begin his priestly studies. After a visit to the college's chapel the Pope visited places in the school which were familiar to him from his student days.

On the occasion of the birth of their daughter, Princess Caroline Louise Marguerite, His Holiness sent a congratulatory message to Prince Rainier and Princess Grace of Monaco. The Pope sent "paternal congratulations, best wishes and blessing to the newly born princess and her august parents."

His Holiness sent his apostolic blessing to those who have followed the spiritual retreats, based on the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola, broadcast by the Spanish national radio network.

In a message to Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of India, the Holy Father expressed his hopes for India's success in her efforts for national development. The message, given on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the establishment of the Indian Republic, said: "Mindful of the aspirations for peace which animate Your Excellency and the Government of India, His Holiness prays that Almighty God may prosper Your Excellency's endeavors so that, in the serenity of peace, the nation may maintain the rhythm of its development for the progressive well-being of its people."

On February 9, the Holy Father attended a requiem Mass in the Sistine Chapel to commemorate the anniversary of the death of his predecessor, Pope Pius XI. After the Mass which was offered by Eugene Cardinal Tisserant His Holiness blessed the catafalque.

During March the Pope asked that prayers be said for more priests in Latin America. In this vast region, which includes the West Indies and both Central and South America, there are close to 170,000,000 Catholics, nearly one-third of the Catholic population of the world. Yet to care for this vast amount of souls there are only 31,000, or about 8 per cent, of the world's priests.

In a recent letter to Fr. Erwin Juraschek, president of the National Diocesan Sodality Directors' Conference of the United States, the Pope urged members of American Sodalities of the Blessed Virgin Mary to send delegates to the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate to be held in Rome next October.

On March 5, His Holiness took advantage of his usual lenten address to the preachers and parish priests of Rome to issue warnings about problems which confront Rome and other cities throughout the world. Among the evils threatening Rome, the Pope singled out indecency in publications, movies, and television. At the same time he scored the attitude of persons who think that they can be

Catholics and communists at the same time. He also lamented the scarcity of religious vocations in the diocese of Rome. At the beginning of his address, the Holy Father underlined the reasons why he should exercise particular interest in his own Diocese of Rome. In the latter half of his discourse, the Holy Father exhorted the priests of Rome to renew themselves and society on the foundation of Christ.

Turning to the problems involved in economics the Pope warned of the dangers to human dignity inherent in a hasty switch to automation. He also counseled against seeking state intervention in economic and social matters. Addressing members of the National Congress of the Christian Union of Business Managers and Directors on March 7, the Pope said: "The all important consideration is man as a person." Technology is a servant of economics, not vice versa, the Pope added. Wherever efforts are being made to increase production, he continued, the question of the worker as a person is sadly neglected. Such neglect could do serious harm to the economy of the entire nation. To avoid this situation, the Pope advised managers and directors of business to interest themselves in the technical training of workers. "It can be foreseen, too, that the era of automation will constantly increase the emphasis on the intellectual qualities of those engaged in production: knowledge, inventiveness, organization, foresight," the Pontiff stated. But, he warned, there is the danger of unemployment for older workers, as well as for younger workers, whenever the nation is forced by competition from other countries to speed up the switch to automation. It is therefore necessary, he continued, to draw up suitable plans so that technical changes will not result in public disaster. In the second part of his speech, the Pope noted the ever increasing tendency to invoke the intervention of the state in economic and social matters. "According to the social techings of the Church," he said, "the state undoubtedly has its special function in shaping human society. To fulfill that function, it must also be strong and have authority. But those who continually call upon the state and place all responsibility upon it only bring it to ruin and also make it the plaything of powerful interested groups." Economic and social reforms, added the Holy Father, depend intimately on man considered as a person, on his moral strength and good will to bear responsibility and to understand and treat with sufficient

knowledge and skill the things which he undertakes and to which he is bound.

In a letter sent in March to the French youth attending a conference of the French Federation of Catholic Students in Paris the Holy Father asked them to begin putting Christian precepts to work in the world of scholarship. "A Catholic student's fundamental duty," said the Pope, "is to illuminate with his own faith the many concepts, foreign to the spirit of the Gospels, which impregnate the modern mentality. In order to do that," he continued, "Catholic students should be adapting their own world to the doctrine of Christ, with an aim to giving good example to their brothers whom they hope to influence. Only in this manner can they bring the liberating influences of Christianity with them when they enter the professional and civic world."

The Ninth National Congress of the Italian Society of the Science of Anesthetics was held at Rome Oct. 15-17, 1956. Three questions were submitted by its president to the Holy Father regarding the religious and moral implications of pain prevention in the light of the natural law and Christian doctrine. Since the questions evoke intellectual and emotional reactions of varied nature in men today, said the Pope, he decided to treat them in an important and lengthy address delivered in French on February 24 to a symposium on anesthesiology. The questions asked of him were:

1) Is there a universal moral obligation to refuse analgesia and to accept physical pain in a spirit of faith?

2) Is it in accord with the spirit of the Gospel to bring about by means of drugs the loss of consciousness and of the use of a man's higher faculties?

3) Is it lawful for the dying or those in danger of death to make use of drugs if there exist medical reasons for their use? Can one use drugs even if the lessening of pain is probably accompanied by a shortening of life?

The treatment given these questions by His Holiness was detailed and clear, a treatment to be read and studied by anyone concerned with these questions. Here the briefest of summary only will be offered.

First of all the Holy Father considered the nature, origin, and development of anesthesia by which long and delicate, even remarkably daring operations, have been made possible. Next he pointed

to the hidden but essential role of the anesthetist whose work has greatly contributed to the advances made by modern surgeons. He then proceeded to give a brief but thorough history of the development of anesthesia.

Turning then to a consideration of the first question, whether there is a general moral obligation to endure physical pain, the Holy Father considered various aspects of the question. In certain cases, he said, the acceptance of physical suffering is a matter of serious obligation, where, for example, it is necessary so to act in order to remain faithful to God and to one's conscience. He then pointed out that: 1) the fundamental principles of the technique of anesthesia give rise to no difficulties for anesthesia combats those forces which in a great many respects produce harmful effects and hinder a greater good; 2) the doctor who accepts its methods enters into contradiction neither with the natural moral order nor with the specifically Christian ideal. He is seeking with the aid of science to bring suffering under man's control; and 3) the patient can lawfully make use of the means discovered by science which, in themselves, are not immoral. Particular circumstances can impose another line of conduct, but the Christian's duty of renunciation and of interior purification is not an obstacle to the use of anesthetics because it is possible to fulfill that duty in another manner. The same rule applies also to the precepts of the Christian ideal which go beyond the call of duty.

Regarding the question of narcosis and the total or partial deprivation of consciousness, the Holy Father explained its relationship to the framework of natural morality. He pointed out that there need not necessarily be a conflict with moral principles or with the spirit of the Gospel provided this narcosis be practiced within the limits permitted by right reason and the conditions of upright moral conduct.

Discussing the matter of pain-killers and the loss of consciousness induced by drugs for the dying, the Holy Father stated that the use of such drugs is lawful, even though it be foreseen that the use of these drugs will shorten life, "provided no other means exist, and if, in the given circumstances, that action does not prevent the carrying out of other moral and religious duties."

He added further that "the ideal of Christian heroism does not require, except in a general way, the refusal of a state of insensi-

bility which is justified on other grounds, even at the approach of death; all depends on the particular circumstances. The most perfect and most heroic decision can be present as fully in acceptance as in refusal."

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1907, entitled "Are We Neglecting a Missionary Opportunity?" by Fr. G. Lee, C.S.Sp., of Pittsburg Catholic College, suggests a form of apostolic work that is seldom emphasized—the baptism of the dying children of non-Catholics. Fr. Lee recommends that Catholic lay persons be urged to explain to such parents the doctrine of the necessity of baptism and to persuade them to allow these Catholics to confer this sacrament on these little ones before they pass into eternity. . . . The appearance of the first volume of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* provides the occasion for an article on this excellent work of scholarship by the editor of the *Review,* Fr. Heuser. He informs the readers that "probably the best work accomplished by our actual Catholic University at Washington is here represented by the scholarly articles of its more prominent professors written for this Encyclopedia, and especially in the discriminating editorial work of Drs. Pace and Shahan. . . . Fr. H. G. Hughes, of England, contributes "Some Thoughts on Papal Infallibility." He discusses particularly the relation between the ***magisterium*** of the Pope and that of the general council. "United with him, speaking through him, a council participates in his infallibility; without him there is no security against error." . . . Fr. Heuser explains with diagrams the requisites for the foundation of a fixed altar, particularly in a church which has a basement. . . . This issue also contains another chapter of the novel *A Clerical Story of Sixes and Sevens,* the theme of which centers about ecclesiastical music. . . . An anonymous writer who signs himself M.L.W. writes about the collects of the Roman Office, discussing in particular the efforts of the ancient writers to produce a rhythm in their prose. . . . In the Studies and Conferences we are told that the dress of the altar boys should be neat and clean, but that "decking the boys with bunches of ribbons, flowers and the like is foreign to the simplicity of the holy place and service."

F. J. C.

Book Reviews

A CALL TO THE LAITY: SELECTED WRITINGS ON THE LAY APOSTOLATE. By the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D.D., Archbishop of Boston. Compiled by the Reverend George L. Kane. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1957. Pp. 237. $3.00.

This is not just another book on the Lay Apostolate. In this series of addresses, sermons and articles by the Archbishop of Boston the role of the laity in the life of the Church is examined with a deep sensitivity to the problems and difficulties that beset the Catholics of our modern day. It is written with a clarity and balance which never loses its dynamic sense of depth and challenge. His Excellency points out that there is only one answer, only one solution for the spiritual and moral degradation of our age and that one answer is personal holiness. "When I sanctify myself, I accomplish my chief duty, the salvation of my soul, but I also make my principal contribution, though not my only one, to the good order of the societies to which I belong, both secular and religious." Undoubtedly most of our laity have heard of their obligations in this regard and have some appreciation of the need of Christ-like living, but are they convinced of it? This stimulating work will bring conviction and the courage to face up to the responsibilities of the Lay Apostolate to which they are called. In an age of wholesale confusion and complexity this volume is a refreshing change.

The last few chapters deal with the subject of Communism and are of special interest in a period when all too many Catholics are forgetful of or are indifferent to its influence, which though hidden in our midst to a large extent, is still a major menace to Faith and Freedom. The tactics of the Reds and so-called Pinks who have never given up their attempt to drive a wedge between the Bishops, Priests, and Laity of the United States, are discussed in an address delivered before a Knights of Columbus forum in Chicago in 1949 and the urgency of that message may well be studied at the present time. Discussion Clubs and High School Classes will find this volume affords much material for mature Christian thinking and for the exercise of a real apostolate. Sunday sermons, too, would gain much by borrowing from its pages.

FRANCIS A. REGAN

PORTRAIT OF PIUS XII. By Nazareno Padellaro. Translated by Michael Derrick. Foreword by Daniel-Rops. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1957. Pp. xiii + 274. $5.00.

CROWN OF GLORY: THE LIFE OF POPE PIUS XII. By Alden Hatch and Seamus Walshe. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1957. Pp. 253. $4.95.

Both of these books are biographies of the present Sovereign Pontiff. Both are objective and reverent in their treatment of the Holy Father and his life. Both are valuable and welcome additions to the already considerable mass of literary material on the subject of the life and times of Pope Pius XII.

Although they are parallel accounts these two works are quite distinct in character. Padellaro's book contains more material. In general, it is more effectively organized. Its account of the years Archbishop Pacelli spent in the displomatic service in Germany is considerably more detailed and more intelligible than that offered in the book by Messrs. Hatch and Walshe. Likewise the Padellaro book contains more information about the activities and the accomplishments of the Holy Father's pontificate than the other.

Unfortunately, Mr. Padellaro tends sometimes to argue and to moralize on his own account when he might better have written strictly as a biographer. Thus, the chapter entitled "The Excommunication of Communism" would certainly have been considerably more valuable and enlightening if its author had paid more attention to what Pope Pius XII and his predecessors had done to check this social and intellectual evil, and had devoted less space to his own theorizing.

The writer of *Portrait of Pius XII* has an exasperating way of intruding his own political and social views into his narrative. On one occasion (pp. 21 f.), he inserts into his brief account of, or, more properly, reference to, the heresy of Modernism, some remarks which, while not altogether clear, seem to reflect a dislike of the men who were faithful to St. Pius X during the years of his struggle against this evil.

Crown of Glory has more of the tourist touch. Most of what it has to say about the pontificate of Pope Pius XII is concerned with the war years. Where Padellaro at least devoted a brief chapter to the " 'Priest-workers' in France," and referred, even though superficially, to some of the Holy Father's doctrinal statements, the Hatch-Walshe book gives no comparable references.

Both books are well and profusely illustrated, although *Crown of Glory* is better than *Portrait of Pius XII* in this respect. Both are informative, and both can be heartily recommended.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

PAPAL SOCIAL PRINCIPLES. By Thomas J. Harte, C.Ss.R. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956. Pp. 207. $3.25.

The heritage of Catholic social thought left to the Church by Pope Leo XIII has been added to in a greater or lesser degree by each of the four pontiffs who have followed him in the chair of Peter. The present book does not attempt to compare the social thinking of the individual popes, nor does the author enumerate the social questions discussed by the Holy See in this period. Either task, he confesses, would be an almost impossible one. Father Harte has presented a readable English summary of the social teaching of the above-named pontiffs. There is no doubt that the author's hope of provoking his readers to re-study the original documents with greater appreciation will be fulfilled. Not intended as a substitute for the original pronouncements of the Holy See, this work is a supplement and guide to papal teaching on actual social problems. The book is not a compilation of pertinent citations of the different popes, but a digest of their teaching on this or that specific social problem as found not only in their encyclicals but in the content of any papal pronouncement.

The book does not contain an introduction as such. The author makes the introduction to the book his first chapter. In this chapter the nature and quality of the Catholic's moral obligation to accept the teaching of the Holy See even in those statements that are not *ex cathedra* is well explained. The chapter entitled "Introductory Encyclicals of Modern Pontiffs" gives a summary of the first encyclical of each of the popes studied. We are assured that "these first encyclicals of the various pontiffs to the whole Christian world are unusually interesting in that they offer a searching analysis of the major social problems of the day and present, in main outlines, at least, the principal remedies for these conditions." Before each summary of the first encyclical there are a few paragraphs on the life and times of the particular pope to set the scene of the encyclical.

Father Harte devotes a chapter to each of the following subjects: the nature of human liberty, the family and education, economic life, the Church, general theory of the State, practical directives for Catholics in particular countries, the international problem, false solutions of world problems, Catholic Action and the lay apostolate, and the Chris-

tian life. The approach in the book centers, however, around the papal documents. Only in a broad sense has the author organized the contents on a topical basis. In this way the various statements of the Holy See are presented in their natural context.

Chapter three deals with the nature of human liberty and serves as an example of the procedure used by the author throughout the book. After a summary of Pope Leo's teaching on "the traditional Catholic ideal of liberty," a digest of the papal thought concerning "the new liberal idea of liberty" follows. Before giving a résumé of "the separation of the Church and State" and "the practical conclusions for governments and people" a summary of the Pope's teaching of "the four modern liberties" is stated.

The chapter on "The General Theory of the State" merits particular attention. A brief indication is given of the general period of unrest that characterized the nineteenth century. In this setting the content of the encyclical *Diuturnum Illud* and the content of one of Pope Leo's most important encyclicals, *Immortale Dei,* are summarized. For those who are unfamiliar with papal teaching on the sociological aspects of the economic life the chapter on this phase of the Holy See's social thought will be enlightening and probably lead to a study of the original documents.

Papal Social Principles fulfills a need for an English language summary of papal thought and teaching on social problems. Those readers who have experienced difficulty in dealing with the encyclicals and apostolic letters will be able to view the content of the Pontiff's teaching in a concise summary form. Those who conduct study clubs will find this book a definite help in their work. Father Harte writes with a thorough knowledge of his subject and experience in teaching it. The references given at the end of each chapter will aid one in selecting further reading on the subject treated. The detailed index at the end of the book is not only complete but will serve in large measure for a topical synthesis.

KENNETH B. MOORE, O.CARM.

THE CHOICE OF GOD. By Dom Hubert Van Zeller. Springfield, Illinois: Templegate, 1956. Pp. viii + 211. $2.75.

THE INNER SEARCH. By Dom Hubert Van Zeller. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1957. Pp. 230. $3.00.

In our lives we must always be striving to make advances in spirituality to God. Of the many means offered to us a most efficacious way

is spiritual reading. This reading is a necessity for ourselves to learn more about the way to God, to be stirred up to better meditations and to greater actions. It also helps us in our task of helping others since good spiritual reading supplies us with new matter for sermons, new ways of leading souls. Most priests are too busy to sit for long periods of time each day to read the ponderous spiritual books but here is a book, *The Choice of God,* that could be kept handy on the desk to be picked up and read for short intervals during the day. Short thought-full chapters on the spiritual life will give the impetus to a deeper and more sincere spiritual life. The author states that this book is intended "for those who seriously pursue the interior life." Should not that be all of us? It lays down principles that may seem hard but they are the same ones Christ Himself taught and seeing them stated in strong terms will remind us of their necessity in our life.

The title of the book is explained in the first chapter. It can mean that in conflict I give in to God's demands, or I choose the course which is more likely to further God's interests, or again, in everything I want God to get more out of the action than I do. For a Saint it means, "I am not going to choose any more, my happiness consists in letting God choose." Throughout the book Dom Van Zeller wishes us to be honest with ourselves and seek perfection which is not primarily in what we do but in what we let God do in us. He traces this idea through many short thought-packed chapters on prayer, purpose, the Mass, Mary, virtues, and work—through the whole of our life. This book can be a fine spur for the busy person who is really trying to choose God in all things.

The Inner Search was primarily written for his confreres in religion but its principles apply to all who are seeking God. His idea of inner search is for us to find our true selves rather than the shadows we have built up from our imagination. Dom Van Zeller asks, "How can we be so second rate in the lives we have chosen to lead when in our calmest and truest moments we know that we are capable of the highest? Nearly always it is because *we* have chosen the lives we lead and have not allowed God to do the choosing for us." Throughout the book great stress is laid on our submission and co-operation with God, rather than depending on ourselves. Through the twenty-six chapters he leads us on the search showing how it affects our relations with God, with self, with others, with creation and happiness; showing us how sanctity is tied up with our Eucharistic life, how it affects our environment, our penance and sufferings; he speaks of the part played by the Holy Spirit and Mary. In all, a practical study of higher spirituality.

On the distinction of ascetical and mystical life he comments, "Asceticism orientates the soul, mysticism looks in the direction indicated

. . . The asceticism that does not find expression in mysticism is a frame without a picture . . . one wonders if such would be worth having. Perhaps it would because an empty frame is better than no frame at all. At least it invites an artist to paint something to go inside." And he adds: "What matters is not the academic distinction between mysticism and asceticism but the interior life which assumes them both and to which the two contribute."

This book will help to broaden our outlook in the spiritual life and teach us the necessity of submission to the Holy Spirit. "All men must grope. But for the mystic or the philosopher, the principle of true wisdom is the same. It comes from one origin and moves to one end. Its common doctrine is that apart from God there is no solution—there are no escapes."

These two books are excellent spiritual reading that will stir us up to make the "Choice of God" and lead us to the "Inner Search" thus helping us personally in our advance in spirituality and help us to help others to find the only way to God and happiness—God Himself.

THOMAS KELLY, C.SS.R.

THE COMMANDMENT OF LOVE. By John J. Sullivan, S.J. New York: Vantage Press, 1956. Pp. xi + 139. $2.75.

On seeing the title of this book it might be thought that the whole matter of the first and greatest commandment has been adequately dealt with in the Catechism and textbooks. But the fact of the matter is different. Father Sullivan points out that one catechism consulted had three hundred pages devoted to the ten commandments while the great commandment was dealt with in three pages. Our moral theology has tended to stress the study of the commandments in themselves rather than in view of the great law of charity. Certainly this points out a distorted view of God.

How often we preach on this commandment in nebulous and high-sounding phrases which when analyzed really do not deliver God's message of love. Father Sullivan, to help clarify our ideas, turns to St. Thomas as a guide and points out how this commandment was taught from the start. In the Old Testament this love of God was preached frequently. In fact, reason alone would lead to choosing God as his ultimate end which in the teaching of St. Thomas is to love Him.

We hear it said that the first three commandments deal with the love of God, while the other seven look to our neighbor. They equate the first and great commandment with the decalogue. But study will